SHOUT
SHARE
IT

S 2702
10.

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of
THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

VOLUME 10

BRITISH MUSEUM
NATURAL HISTORY

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

LONDON:
Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1953—1954

(All rights reserved)

THANKS TO I.U.B.S. AND U.N.E.S.C.O.

THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

has great pleasure

in

expressing its grateful thanks

to the

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES (I.U.B.S.)

and to the

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.)

for the financial assistance

afforded

towards the cost of organising the

Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature, Copenhagen, July-August 1953

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

(*composition at the time of the preparation of the Agenda for the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature, Copenhagen,* 1953)

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President: Dr. Karl Jordan (*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)

President: Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (27th November 1952)

Vice-President: Senhor Afranio do Amaral (*Instituto Butantan, Sao Paulo, Brazil*)

Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Afranio do Amaral (*Instituto Butantan, Sao Paulo, Brazil*) (1st January 1944) (*Vice-President*)

Professor J. R. Dymond (*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*) (1st January 1944)

Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (28th March 1944)

Professor Harold E. Vokes (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) (23rd April 1944)

Professor Béla Hankó (*Békéscsaba, Hungary*) (1st January 1947)

Dr. Norman R. Stoll (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (1st January 1947)

Professor H. Boschma (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (1st January 1947)

Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) (27th July 1948)

Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948) (*Secretary*)

Dr. Joseph Pearson (*Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*) (27th July 1948)

Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) (27th July 1948)

Professor Teiso Esaki (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (17th April 1950)

Professor Pierre Bonnet (*Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France*) (9th June 1950)

Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) (9th June 1950)

Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (*Warsaw University, Warsaw, Poland*) (15th June 1950)

Professor Robert Mertens (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a.M., Germany*) (5th July 1950)

Professor Erich Martin Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) (5th July 1950)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission
(*June*, 1954)

Honorary Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary: Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist: Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

Administrative Officer: Mrs. S. C. Watkins, M.A.

Secretariat:
- Mrs. J. H. Newman
- Mrs. Prudence Goldman
- Mrs. E. M. Lewis

Indexer: Miss Joan Kelley, B.Sc.

Translator: Mrs. R. H. R. Hopkin

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Chairman: The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Managing Director and Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer: Mrs. C. Rosner

ADDRESSES OF THE COMMISSION AND THE TRUST

Secretariat of the Commission: 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.

Offices of the Trust: 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

FOREWORD

The present volume contains the second and concluding portion of the documents which were gathered together to form the Agenda for the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature held, under the auspices of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, at Copenhagen in July—August 1953.

2. The first instalment which comprised the extensive documentation submitted in regard to the first three items on the Agenda of the Colloquium were published in volume 8 of the present serial. The present volume comprises the two hundred and thirty-six documents submitted to the Colloquium in connection with the remaining items on its Agenda (Cases Nos. 4—70).

3. For the reasons explained in the Foreword to volume 8, there was only a period of about five months in which to pilot that and the present volume through the press, if, as was essential, the two volumes were to be ready for consideration by the Colloquium when it assembled at Copenhagen on 29th July 1953. It will be appreciated therefore that the task of passing some eight hundred pages of print through the press in so short a period was one of considerable difficulty. In such circumstances it was impossible to devote the normal amount of time to the reading of proofs and, in consequence, the present volume contains a number of misprints, especially in papers published in some language other than English or containing words in Greek or other languages using alphabets other than the Latin alphabet. The Trust offers its apologies to the authors of the papers concerned. Certain other misprints are corrected on page 526.

4. It will be appreciated that the documents published in this volume represent only the working papers which were before the Colloquium when it considered the various nomenclatorial issues concerned and that in numerous cases the opportunities for interchanges of views presented by the long discussions which took place at the meetings of the Colloquium led individual specialists who had presented documents published in the present volume to modify their views in the light of considerations advanced by other members of the Colloquium. For these reasons and because, in the case of each of the problems concerned, a definite decision was reached by the Copenhagen Congress, the value of the present volume rests mainly in its historical interest. The documents published in the present volume should therefore be looked upon only as being in the nature of a background to the decisions taken by the Copenhagen Congress and should be read only in conjunction with those decisions.

5. The decisions on the questions dealt with in the present volume taken by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953,

on the advice of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, assisted by the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature, together with decisions taken by it on other questions of zoological nomenclature, have been published, at the request of the Copenhagen Congress, by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature in a book entitled *Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature.* This book, which was published on 31st December 1953, is obtainable from :—The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, Publications Office, 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7 (price five shillings (5/-), plus postage).

6. In order to facilitate the reading of the present volume, I have annexed to the present Foreword a Statement giving, for each of the sixty-seven items of the Colloquium's Agenda concerned, a reference to the page in the book *Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature* where will be found the decision taken by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953, on the item concerned.

7. In completing the present volume, the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature desires to express its grateful thanks to Professor R. Spärck, President of the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology for the admirable arrangements made by him for the accommodation of the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature during its meeting at Copenhagen, arrangements which contributed to an important degree to the successful outcome of its deliberations.

FRANCIS HEMMING

Secretary to the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature

28, Park Village East,
Regent's Park,
LONDON, N.W.1.
10*th June* 1954.

ANNEXE TO FOREWORD

DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE FOURTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, COPENHAGEN, 1953, ON THE NOMENCLATORIAL PROBLEMS DEALT WITH IN THE PRESENT VOLUME

Case No. (1)	*Subject* (2)	*Page in "Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature" containing decision taken on problem specified in Col.* (2) (3)
4	Problems involved in devising provisions for inclusion in the *Règles* for the naming of Orders (including Sub-Orders) and Taxonomic Categories of Higher Rank	38—43
5	Problems involved in the emendation of names: proposed revision of Article 19 of the *Règles* ...	43—46
6	Status to be accorded to a trivial name which, when first published, (a) was stated to be a substitute for a previously published name, and (b) was, in addition, applied to a particular species or to particular specimens, where that species is not the same as that to which the previously published name is applicable	75, 76
7	On the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which was first published without any separate " indication " in a generic synonymy	63
8	Article 14 : formation of a trivial name based upon the name of a modern personage, the first portion of which consists of the particle " M "	48, 55, 79
9	Articles 8 and 14 : choice of connective vowels in the formation of names consisting of compound words	43, 55, 81
10	Article 14, Paragraph (3), Section (c) : method to be followed when forming a trivial name based upon the surname of a Russian woman on the transliteration of that name from the Cyrillic alphabet into the Latin alphabet	54

Case No. (1)	*Subject* (2)	*Page in "Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature" containing decision taken on problem specified in Col.* (2) (3)
11	Article 14 : problem arising in connection with trivial names based upon modern patronymics in cases where those patronymics are already in a Latinised form	53
12	Article 14 : procedure to be followed when forming a trivial name based upon a modern patronymic in cases where that patronymic consists of more than two words, of which the first is the definite article	48, 55
13	Article 14 : procedure to be followed when forming a trivial name based either (i) upon the name of a modern personage where that name is preceded by a nobiliar particle or (ii) upon the name of a Christian Saint	55
14	Article 14 : proposed regularisation of the status of trivial names based on modern patronymics, when formed as adjectives	53
15	Article 14 : question whether it is desirable that trivial names based upon modern patronymics in the genitive singular and incorrectly formed with a double terminal " -ii " should, as decided in Paris in 1948, be subject to automatic correction ...	54, 82
16	Article 14 (or associated Article) : question of the gender attributable to generic names consisting of compound words of Greek or Latin origin... ...	50
17	Article 15 : proposed amplification of the provisions relating to the formation of trivial names consisting of compound words	56
18	Article 16 : proposed addition of a *Recommandation* relating to the formation of trivial names based upon geographical terms and having the termination " -ensis"	57

Case No. (1)	*Subject* (2)	*Page in "Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature" containing decision taken on problem specified in Col.* (2) (3)
19	Article 16 : proposed amplification of provisions relating to the formation of trivial names based upon geographical terms	57
20	Article 20 : proposed deletion from, of reference to diacritic marks	57
21	Article 20 : proposed amendment of concluding portion of *Recommandation*	57
22	Article 20 : proposed addition of a *Recommandation* deprecating the use of diphthongs in the printing of scientific names	58
23	Article 21 : proposed clarification of a decision taken in 1948 regarding the method to be adopted for determining the circumstances in which a new name is to be attributed to an author other than that by whom the book or paper in which the new name was published was written	58
24	Article 22 : proposed drafting amendment of, in the interests of consistency	59
25	Article 23 : authorship of a combination	59
26	Article 24 : proposed establishment of a method of citation in cases where a species is doubtfully referred to a given genus and where one species is doubtfully identified with another	60
27	Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision that the distribution of a microfilm does not constitute "publication" of the paper reproduced in this manner and therefore that no new name contained in such a paper possesses any status in zoological nomenclature	60

Case No. (1)	*Subject* (2)	*Page in "Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature" containing decision taken on problem specified in Col.* (2) (3)
28	Article 25 : proposed co-ordination with other parts of the *Règles* of the provision in, relating to the nomenclatorial status of books and papers, the manner of the issue of which does not satisfy the tests prescribed for "publication"...	61
29	Article 25 : proposed redrafting of, in order to make it clear that, for a name to become available, it must be published with diagnostic characters ...	61, 62
30	Article 35 : proposed insertion of a provision denying availability to a trivial name of a Fossil species unless at the time of the publication of that name there was published also a figure of the species in question	62
31	Article 25 : question whether a name given to a nominal genus, the type specimen of the type species of which is a pathological monstrosity should be given any status of availability	63
32	Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision that a name published by an author who made it clear that his object in so doing was some purpose other than that of providing a name for use in zoological nomenclature possesses no status of availability ...	63
33	Article 25 : question of the status to be accorded to generic names and trivial names published as *nomina nuda* in synonymies	63
34	Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision that a trivial name consisting of spelled-out letters or numerals shall not be accepted as available when those letters or numerals were originally employed as ordinals for the enumeration of the species, subspecies or infra-specific names concerned ...	64

Case No. (1)	*Subject* (2)	*Page in "Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature" containing decision taken on problem specified in Col.* (2) (3)
35	Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision denying the status of availability to a trivial name inadvertently published as the result of the misreading of a previous publication or of a museum label or the like	65
36	Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision that certain classes of generic names published for fossil species and bearing the termination " -ites ", " -ytes ", or " -thes " possess no status in zoological nomenclature	65
37	Article 25, Proviso (a) : proposed insertion of words to make it clear that a trivial name having as its indication only a qualified reference to a previously published trivial name does not satisfy the requirements of the foregoing Proviso	66
38	Article 28 : proposed restoration, in whole or in part, of the First Reviser principle	66, 67
39	Article 30 : proposed insertion of a provision clarifying the question of the nominal species to be regarded as eligible for selection as the type species of a genus established without cited nominal species, in cases where a subsequent author, without citing such a species, gives a bibliographical reference to a work in which such a species is cited	67
40	Article 30 : proposed amendment of the provisions relating to the procedure to be followed in dealing with nominal genera based, or alleged to have been based, upon misidentified type species	68
41	Article 30 : proposed clarification of Rule (c)... ...	70

Case No. (1)	*Subject* (2)	*Page in "Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature" containing decision taken on problem specified in Col.* (2) (3)
42	Article 30, Rule (f) (Rule relating to the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which is published to replace an earlier name): proposed introduction of words to make it clear that this Rule applies only where a name is expressly published as a substitute for another name	70
43	Article 30, Rule (f): proposed clarification of the position as regards the nominal species eligible to be the type species of two nominal genera, of which the name of one was published as a substitute for the name of the other	71
44	Article 30, Rule (g): proposed insertion of words to make it clear that the selection of a structure exhibited by a specimen referred to a given species as typical of a given genus does not constitute the selection of that species as the type species of that genus	69, 71
45	Article 30: proposed repeal of the portion of Rule (g) arising from the interpretation in *Opinion* 6 ...	72
46	Article 31: proposed amendment of provisions relating to nominal species subjectively regarded by taxonomists as composite species	72, 74
47	Article 31: proposed refinement of provisions relating to lectotypes	73
48	Article 31: suggested drafting amendments ...	72—75, 77
49	Article 32: proposed insertion of a provision for the rejection of a name on the ground of inappropriateness in certain circumstances	78

Case No. (1)	*Subject* (2)	*Page in "Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature" containing decision taken on problem specified in Col.* (2) (3)
50	Articles 34 and 35 : proposed addition of the consonantal "i" and the consonantal "j" and "yi" as forming a group of identical letters for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy	78, 80
51	Articles 34 and 35 : question whether names consisting of words differing from one another in spelling only by the presence in the one case and by the absence in the other, of a diacritic mark over, or under, one of the letters of which the word is composed are to be treated as homonyms of one another	79
52	Articles 34 and 35 : proposed clarification of certain aspects of, in relation to names differing from one another only through the presence or absence of diacritic marks	79
53	Articles 34 and 35 : proposal that difference in spelling arising solely from differences in the manner in which the word forming a name has been transliterated into the Latin alphabet from some other alphabet should be ignored for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy	80
54	Articles 34 and 35 : proposal that differences in the spelling of names based upon barbarous words arising solely from the adoption of different methods for transcribing into the Latin alphabet the barbarous word concerned should be disregarded for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy ...	79, 81
55	Article 35 : proposed insertion of a provision that, for the purposes of establishing a condition of secondary homonymy between two specific names, it is not necessary that an author should expressly cite the names in a homonymous combination before rejecting, and replacing, the later published of the two trivial names involved	82

Case No. (1)	*Subject* (2)	*Page in "Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature" containing decision taken on problem specified in Col.* (2) (3)
56	Transcription of the Latin "v" (vowel) and "v" (consonantal) and of the Latin "i" (vowel) and "i" (consonantal)	83
57	New Article relating to the status of names published as the names of infra-subspecific forms: proposal to extend the period of grace before the new rules apply in their entirety to names published for taxonomic units below the species level but not clearly intended to apply to populations as contrasted with individual forms and other minority elements, and to relax the definition for such names	84
58	Infra-subspecific names: proposal to withdraw recognition from	83
59	Nomenclature of the specific complex	85
60	Proposed substitution of the term "specific name" in place of the term "trivial name" for the second portion of a binominal combination	21
61	Proposed adoption of the adjective "nominate" in place of the adjective "nominotypical" to denote the sub-species of a polytypic species upon which the original description of that species was based ...	21
62	Need for uniformity of rules of zoological nomenclature for the whole of the Animal Kingdom ...	85
63	Trend away from "automatic nomenclature" ...	85
64	Proposal for broadcasting the basis of the authority of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature	86—92

Case No. (1)	*Subject* (2)	*Page in "Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature" containing decision taken on problem specified in Col.* (2) (3)
65	Relationship between the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the International Congress of Zoology: proposed maintenance of existing arrangements	86
66	Question of the size of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature...	86—89
67	Qualifications to be looked for in candidates for election as Members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and method to be adopted for election	86—89
68	Period of service of Members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature	86, 90, 91
69	On the giving of advance notice by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of action proposed to be taken in particular cases	86, 91
70	Copyright of publications issued by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature	95

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Documents prepared for consideration by the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature, Copenhagen, 1953 and by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature during its Session of Meetings to be held in Copenhagen in July-August 1953

PART 1

PROBLEMS POSTPONED BY THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, PARIS, 1948, FOR FURTHER CONSULTATIONS WITH INTERESTED SPECIALISTS AND FOR SUBMISSION TO THE FOURTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, COPENHAGEN, 1953

(continued from volume 8)

CASE No. 4

Problems involved in devising provisions for inclusion in the " Règles " for the naming of Orders (including Sub-Orders) and Taxonomic Categories of Higher Rank

Page

Document 4/1.—Origin of the present investigation. Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 2

Document 4/2.—General consultation with specialists and issue of an Appeal for advice in 1952. Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 3

Document 4/3.—Examples of competing names for Classes submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 3

Page

Document 4/4.—Names for Tribes and Sub-Tribes. Suggestions by PE. JESUS MOURE, C.M.F. (*Museu Paranaense e Universidade de Parana*) and L. TRAVASSOS FILHO (*Departmente de Zoologia de Sao Paulo, Brazil*) 4

Document 4/5.—Resolution adopted at the Final Plenary Session of the Congreso Cientifico Mexicana, 1951. Letter, dated 29th October 1951, from JESUS SILVA HERZOG, *Presidente, Comision Ejecutiva del Congreso* 4

Document 4/6.—Results of a Preliminary Survey of Group Endings in Zoological Classifications above the Category of Genus. By LEONARD P. SCHULTZ (*Smithsonian Institution, United States National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 5

Document 4/7.—The Possible Addition to the *Règles* of Provisions Governing the Naming of Orders and Higher Taxonomic Categories. By G. H. E. HOPKINS, O.B.E., M.A. (*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts.*) 9

Document 4/8.—Letter dated 15th April 1952 from L. B. HOLTHUIS (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) ... 11

Document 4/9.—Suggestions furnished by FRANZ DANIEL (*Zoologische Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, München, Germany*) 12

Document 4/10.—Explanatory Note by TH. HALTENORTH (*Museum, München, Germany*) and communicated by E. M. HERING (*Abteilungsleiter am Zoologischen Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*) 13

Document 4/11.—Extract from a letter dated 23rd May 1952 by W. J. ARKELL, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. (*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge*) 16

Document 4/12.—Statement by J. R. DYMOND (*University of Toronto, Department of Zoology, Toronto, Canada*)... 16

Document 4/13.—Enclosure to a letter concerning Commission's Ref. Z.N.(S.) 360 (Naming of Orders and Higher Taxonomic Categories) and Appendix to Answers to Inquiry by S. G. KIRIAKOFF, L.Sc. (*Zoological Museum, Ghent University, Belgium*)... 18

Page

Document 4/14.—Stellungnahme zu den Vorschlagen zur Einfuhrung von Vorschriften über die Beneffung der Ordnungen und Hoheren Kategorien in die *Règles* by ERICH M. HERING (*Abteilungsleiter am Zoologischen Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*), with an Annexe giving the Views of WALTER FORSTER (*Zoologische Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, München, Germany*) 19

Document 4/15.—Statement furnished by JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) 20

Document 4/16.—Statement of the views of the SCIENTIFIC STAFF OF THE ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM OF ZOOLOGY AND PALAEONTOLOGY, TORONTO, CANADA 21

Document 4/17.—Comment on the Proposal to Include Orders and Higher Taxonomic Categories in the *Règles* by A. MYRA KEEN and SIEMON W. MULLER (*Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*) 22

Document 4/18.—Statement of the views of the COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK. Enclosure to a letter, dated 10th July 1952, from JOHN T. ZIMMER, *Chairman* 23

Document 4/19.—Two letters dated 17th July 1952 furnished by HENNING LEMCHE (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) 24

Document 4/20.—Enclosure to a letter dated 22nd July 1952 furnished by E. RAYMOND HALL (*University of Kansas, Department of Zoology, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) 27

Document 4/21.—Orders and Higher Categories ; Z.N.(S.) 360. Statement setting out the views of members of the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY... 28

  Appendices 1 and 2 : Summary of the problem involved in the naming of Orders and Higher Categories 28

    Enclosure 1 : Brief Summary of problems by J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) and ROBERT L. USINGER (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) 28

Page

Enclosure 2 : Commentary on the proposals relating to the naming of Orders and Higher Categories summarised in Enclosure 1 by J. CHESTER BRADLEY and ROBERT L. USINGER... ... 30

Appendix 3 : Comments furnished by CURTIS W. SABROSKY (*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 32

Appendix 4 : Comment furnished by CHARLES D. MICHENER (*University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) 33

Appendix 5 : Comment furnished by W. I. FOLLETT (*California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.*) 33

Appendix 6 : Comment furnished by HENRY TOWNES (*United States National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)... 33

Appendix 7 : Comments furnished by JOHN W. WELLS (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 34

Appendix 8 : Comments furnished by JOHN T. ZIMMER (*American Museum of Natural History, New York, U.S.A.*) 34

Appendix 9 : Extract from the proceedings of a Symposium on Zoological Nomenclature relating to the naming of Orders and other Higher Categories held by the Pacific Section of the SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY AT THE OREGON STATE COLLEGE, Cornwallis, Oregon, U.S.A. 34

Document 4/22.—Orders (Commission Reference Z.N.(S.) 360) ; Statement of the views of the AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON ENTOMOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE 36

Document 4/23.—Orders (Commission's Reference Z.N.(S.) 360) ; Statement of the views of members of the COMMITTEE ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ICHTHYOLOGISTS AND HERPETOLOGISTS. Letter, with enclosures, from W. I. FOLLETT (*California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.*), *Chairman* 39

Appendix 1 : The Nomenclature of the Higher Animal Categories [presented anonymously] 42

Appendix 2 : Statement furnished by CHARLES M. BOGERT (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 46

Page

Appendix 3 : Statement furnished by WILLIAM A. GOSLINE (*University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii*) 49

Appendix 4 : Statement furnished by CARL L. HUBBS (*Scripps Institution of Oceanography, La Jolla, California, U.S.A.*) 50

Appendix 5 : Statement furnished by ROBERT R. MILLER (*Smithsonian Institution, United States National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 51

Appendix 6 : Statement furnished by HOBART M. SMITH (*University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 53

Enclosure 1 : Higher Categories by HOBART M. SMITH 53

Enclosure 2 : Naming of Orders and Higher Categories by HOBART M. SMITH 54

Appendix 7 : Statement furnished by NORMAN J. WILLIMOVSKY (*Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*) 56

Appendix 8 : Statement furnished by ROBERT C. STEBBINS ... 58

Document 4/24.—Statement of the views of ENTOMOLOGISCHE GESELLSCHAFT, BASEL. Extract from letter from HENRY BEURET (*Neuewelt près Bâle, Switzerland*) 59

Document 4/25.—Statement furnished by J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 59

Document 4/26.—Reference Z.N.(S.) 360. (Ordinal, etc. names) by W. E. CHINA, M.A., D.Sc. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) 59

Document 4/27.—Extract from a letter by K. H. L. KEY (*Commonwealth Scientific and Research Organisation, Division of Entomology, Canberra, Australia*) 59

Document 4/28.—Statement furnished by the AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PARASITOLOGISTS 60

CASE No. 5

Documents relevant to the consideration of the problem of the emendation of names

Page

Document 5/1.—Origin of the present investigation. Note by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 61

Document 5/2.—General consultation with specialists and issue of an appeal for advice in 1952. Note by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 62

Document 5/3.—Objection to the emendation of names on entomological grounds. By RAYMOND C. MOORE (*University of Kansas, Lawrence, U.S.A.*) 63

Document 5/4.—Pierre Bonnet's proposal regarding the spelling to be adopted for a word for which more than one spelling is in use. Note by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 65

Document 5/5.—Comment upon Pierre Bonnet's proposition No. 10. By LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO (*University of Parma, Italy*) 66

Document 5/6.—Proposals in a report by a SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION COMMITTEE ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE published in July 1948. Note by the Secretary of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 67

Document 5/7.—Comment on the proposals brought forward by a SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION COMMITTEE ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE in 1948. By JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) 68

Document 5/8.—On the principles which should govern the spelling of names. By JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) 71

Document 5/9.—Letter dated 28th February 1951. By JOHN T. ZIMMER (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) ... 75

Document 5/10.—Problems of grammar and nomenclature. By CESARE EMILIANI (*University of Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) ... 76

Page

Document 5/11.—Relative status for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy of scientific names consisting of compound words differing from one another in spelling only by the use of different connective vowels. By JAMES L. PETERS (*Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*) 82

Document 5/12.—Letter dated 12th June 1951. By W. D. LANG (late of *British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Department of Geology, London*) 83

Document 5/13.—Variations in spelling of homonymous names. By J. MARVIN WELLER (*University of Chicago, Department of Geology, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 84

Document 5/14.—On the reform of Article 19 of the *Règles* relating to the conditions in which emendations of scientific names should be made or accepted. By G. H. E. HOPKINS, O.B.E., M.A. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts.*) ... 86

Document 5/15.—The emendation of zoological names. By C. W. WRIGHT (*London*) 89

Document 5/16.—Statement received on 28th March 1952. By RUDOLF RICHTER (*Forschungs-Institut, Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) 90

Document 5/17.—Diacritic Marks. Note by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature[1] 101

Document 5/18.—Letter dated 11th April 1952. By L. B. HOLTHUIS (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) ... 102

Document 5/19.—Emendation of names: Comments on matters discussed in Part 1/2 of Vol. 7 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. By D. K. McE. KEVAN (*School of Agriculture, Zoology Section, University of Nottingham, Sutton Bonington, Loughborough, England*) 109

Document 5/20.—Statement dated 14th May 1952. By THEODOR HALTENORTH (*Museum, München, Germany*) 111

---

[1] See also Case No. 20.

Page

Document 5/21.—Statement dated 16th May 1952. By LEO SHELJUZHKO (*Zoologische Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, München, Germany*) 114

Document 5/22.—Extract from a letter dated 23rd May 1952. By W. J. ARKELL, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. (*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge, University, Cambridge*) 115

Document 5/23.—Statement received on 27th May 1952. By J. R. DYMOND (*University of Toronto, Department of Zoology, Toronto, Canada*) 115

Document 5/24.—Statement received on 7th June 1952. By ERICH M. HERING (*Abteilungsleiter am Zoologischen Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*) 116

Document 5/25.—Letter dated 14th June 1952. By HENNING LEMCHE (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen*) 117

Document 5/26.—Criticism of Mr. Francis Hemming's proposals for the emendation of zoological names. By K. H. L. KEY (*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Division of Entomology, Canberra, Australia*) 119

Document 5/27.—Statement received on 24th June 1952. By JOSHUA L. BAILY, JR. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)... 125

Document 5/28.—Statement of the views of the SCIENTIFIC STAFF OF THE ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM OF ZOOLOGY AND PALEONTOLOGY, TORONTO, CANADA 126

Document 5/29.—Statement of the views of the COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK 127

Document 5/30.—Statement submitted on behalf of the NOMENCLATURE DISCUSSION GROUP, WASHINGTON, D.C. with enclosures, from R. E. BLACKWELDER, *Secretary*... 129

Annexe 1 : Revised proposal for errors and emendations in the Rules of Zoological Nomenclature 130

Annexe 2 : Paper entitled "A Revised proposal for errors and emendations in the Rules of Zoological Nomenclature" prepared in 1948 by a SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION COMMITTEE ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE ... 131

Page

Document 5/31.—Enclosure to a letter dated 22nd July 1952. By E. RAYMOND HALL (*University of Kansas, Department of Zoology, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) 135

Document 5/32.—Statement submitted on behalf of the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY. Letter, dated 24th July 1952, with enclosures, from W. I. FOLLETT, *Chairman* (*California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.*) 135

Appendix 1 : The emendation of zoological names. By CURTIS W. SABROSKY (*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) ... 136

Appendix 2 : Comments received by the Chairman from members of the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY 141

Enclosure 1 : Comment by CHARLES D. MICHENER (*University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) 141

Enclosure 2 : Comment by ROBERT R. MILLER (*Smithsonian Institution, United States National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 141

Enclosure 3 : Comment by CURTIS SABROSKY (*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 142

Enclosure 4 : Comment by HENRY TOWNES (*United States National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 142

Enclosure 5 : Comment by JOHN W. WELLS (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)... 142

Enclosure 6 : Comments by JOHN T. ZIMMER (*American Museum of National History, New York, U.S.A.*) 143

Appendix 3 : Discussion in connection with a Symposium on Zoological Nomenclature organised in July 1952 by the PACIFIC SECTION OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY ... 143

Enclosure 1 : Paper by W. I. FOLLETT submitted to the Symposium on Zoological Nomenclature held by the PACIFIC SECTION OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY on 20th June 1952 143

Enclosure 2 : Extract from the Minutes of the above-mentioned Symposium 148

Page

Enclosure 3: Letter dated 8th July 1952 from CURTIS W. SABROSKY to W. I. FOLLETT 151

Document 5/33.—Statement of the views of the AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON ENTOMOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE 152

Note by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 152

Continuation of statement furnished by the AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON ENTOMOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE 154

Document 5/34.—Statement of the views of the ENTOMOLOGISCHE GESELLSCHAFT, BASEL 156

Document 5/35.—Comments on the plan suggested by Secretary Hemming to govern the emendation of zoological names. By J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, U.S.A.*) 157

Document 5/36.—Extract from a letter dated 20th August 1952. By W. E. CHINA, M.A., D.Sc. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) 162

Document 5/37.—Enclosure to a letter dated 26th August 1952. By H. B. WHITTINGTON (*Department of Invertebrate Palaeontology, Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*) 163

Document 5/38.—Letter dated 22nd September 1952. By OTTO H. HAAS (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) ... 164

Document 5/39.—Letter dated 7th January 1953. By HENNING LEMCHE (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen*) 166

CASE No. 6

Documents relevant to the consideration of the status to be accorded to a trivial name, which when first published, was stated to be a substitute for a previously published name but was in addition applied to a particular species or to particular specimens in cases where the species concerned differs from that to which the earlier name is applicable

Document 6/1.—Origin of the present investigation. Note by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 167

Page

Document 6/2.—General consultation with specialists and issue of an appeal for advice in 1953. Note by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature... 168

Document 6/3.—Proposals relating to the specimen which should be accepted in certain circumstances as the type specimen of a species to which a substitute name is given. By W. J. ARKELL, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. (*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge*)... 169

Document 6/4.—Request for a Ruling on the interpretation to be given to the name *Ptinus Tectus* Boieldieu 1856, a name published partly for certain specimens and partly as a substitute name for a previously published name. By H. E. HINTON, Ph.D. (then of the *British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*, now of *Bristol University*) ... 172

Document 6/5.—The application to be given to a trivial name which, when first published, was both applied to a particular species or to particular specimens and also stated to be a substitute name for some previously published trivial name or is clearly implied to be such a substitute. By R. CASEY (*Geological Museum and Survey, London*) 174

Document 6/6.—The application of a trivial name which, when first published, is applied to a particular species or specimen, but which is stated also to be a substitute name for some previously published name. By G. H. E. HOPKINS, O.B.E., M.A. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts.*) 177

Document 6/7.—Reply to questionnaire, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 127—130. By LESLIE BAIRSTOW, M.A. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Department of Geology, London*) 179

Document 6/8.—Substitute names. By G. KRUSEMAN (*Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*) 180

Document 6/9.—Statement by TH. HALTENORTH (*Museum, München, Germany*) 181

Document 6/10.—Substitute names. By C. W. WRIGHT (*London*) ... 183

Page

Document 6/11.—Statement received on 7th June 1952. By ERICH M. HERING (*Abteilungsleiter am Zoologischen Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*) 185

Document 6/12.—Problem on substitute names. By CURTIS W. SABROSKY (*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)... ... 186

Document 6/13.—Statement of the views of the COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK 187

Document 6/14.—Extract from a letter dated 20th July 1952. By HENNING LEMCHE (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen*) 188

Document 6/15.—Enclosure to a letter dated 22nd July 1952. By E. RAYMOND HALL (*University of Kansas, Department of Zoology, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) 188

Document 6/16.—Statement of the views of certain members of the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY in a letter dated 26th July 1952, with enclosures, from W. I. FOLLETT, *Chairman* 189

Annexe 1 : Comment by HENRY TOWNES (*North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering of the University of North Carolina Raleigh, North Carolina, U.S.A.*) 189

Annexe 2 : Statement furnished by JOHN T. ZIMMER (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 189

Document 6/17.—Statement received on 30th July 1952. By J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 190

Document 6/18.—Extract from a letter dated 4th September 1952. By K. H. L. KEY (*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Division of Entomology, Canberra, Australia*) 194

Document 6/19.—Problems of nomenclatorial practice now under consideration by the International Commission : Secretary Francis Hemming's Fourth and Fifth problems[2]. By ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY (*Department of Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) 195

---

[2] These problems have since been renumbered and are now Cases Nos. 6 and 7 respectively.

CASE No. 7

On the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which was first published in a generic synonymy[3]

Page

Document 7/1.—Report by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 201

PART 2

PROBLEMS RELATING TO THE TEXT OF THE "REGLES", OTHER THAN THE SEVEN PROBLEMS ON WHICH THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, PARIS, 1948, CALLED FOR SPECIAL REPORTS FOR SUBMISSION TO THE FOURTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY AT COPENHAGEN IN 1953

CASE No. 8

Article 14 : formation of a generic name or a trivial name based upon the name of a modern personage, the first portion of which consists of the particle " M "

Document 8/1.—Letter dated 27th September 1950 from G. H. E. HOPKINS, O.B.E., M.A. (*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*) 206

---

[3] See also in this connection Case No. 33.

Page

Document 8/2.—Correspondence by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* with G. H. E. HOPKINS and PIERRE BONNET 207

Letter dated 3rd October 1950 to G. H. E. HOPKINS (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*) 207

Letter dated 31st October 1950 to PIERRE BONNET (*Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France*) 207

Document 8/3.—Letter dated 8th November 1950 from PIERRE BONNET (*Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France*) 208

Document 8/4.—Supplementary Proposal to apply to generic names, for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy, the proposals submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet in respect of trivial names. By FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 208

CASE No. 9

Articles 8 and 14 : choice of connective vowels in the formation of names consisting of compound words

Document 9/1.—Proposition d'une règlementation pour la formation des termes scientifiques composés de deux mots (choix de la voyelle de liaison). By PIERRE BONNET (*Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France*) 209

Document 9/2.—Comment on Professor Pierre Bonnet's proposals by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 210

CASE No. 10

Article 14, Paragraph (3), Section (C) : method to be followed when forming a trivial name based upon the surname of a Russian woman on the transliteration of that name from the Cyrillic alphabet to the Latin alphabet

Page

Document 10/1.—Extract from a letter dated 18th September 1946 from ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) 211

Document 10/2.—Extract from Proposition 5 submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at Paris in 1948 by PIERRE BONNET (*Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France*) ... 212

CASE No. 11

Article 14 : problem arising in connection with trivial names based upon modern patronymics in cases where those patronymics are in a Latinised form

Document 11/1.—Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 213

CASE No. 12

Article 14 : question of the formation of a trivial name based upon a modern patronymic in cases where that patronymic consists of more than two words of which the first is the definite article

Document 12/1.—Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 214

Document 12/2.—Statement furnished by the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ICHTHYOLOGISTS AND HERPETOLOGISTS. 215

CASE No. 13

Article 14 : procedure to be followed when forming a trivial name based either (1) upon the name of a modern personage where that name is preceded by a Nobiliar particle or (2) upon the name of a Christian Saint

Page

Document 13/1.—Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 218

Document 13/2.—Proposal 5 of Prof. Bonnet (proposal to modify paragraph (c) of Article 14) giving more detailed rules on the way to form trivial names dedicated to one or more persons. By LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO (*University of Parma, Italy*) 219

Document 13/3.—Comment on Point (5) in Professor Pierre Bonnet's Proposition 5. By ANGEL CABRERA (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) 220

CASE No. 14

Article 14 : proposed regularisation of the status of trivial names based on modern patronymics, when formed as adjectives

Document 14/1.—Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 221

CASE No. 15

Article 14 : question whether it is desirable that trivial names based upon modern patronymics in the genitive singular and incorrectly formed with a terminal double "-ii" should be subject to automatic correction

Document 15/1.—Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 222

Page

Document 15/2.—Steelungnahme zu den Vorschlagen von Dr. C. J. Stubblefield (Z.N.(S.) 409) in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6(5) : 150, London, 15th April 1952. By RUDOLF RICHTER (*Senckenbergische Naturforschende Gesellschaft, Senckenberg-Anlage, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) 224

CASE No. 16

Article 14 (or associated article) : question of the gender attributable to generic names consisting of compound words of Greek or Latin origin

Document 16/1.—Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 226

Document 16/2.—Letter dated 1st December 1949. From REEVE M. BAILEY (*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*) ... 228

Document 16/3.—Gender of generic names which are compound words of Greek or Latin origin. By L. W. GRENSTED, D.D. (*Oriel College, Oxford*) 229

CASE No. 17

Article 15 : proposed amplification of the provisions relating to the formation of trivial names consisting of compound words

Document 17/1.—Proposition 8. By PIERRE BONNET (*Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France*) 231

Document 17/2.—Proposal No. 8 of Prof. Bonnet (proposal to add Articles 15*bis*, 15*ter* and 15*quater* specifying the manner of forming compound trivial names). By LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO (*University of Parma, Italy*) 234

CASE No. 18

Article 16: proposed addition of a "Recommandation" relating to the formation of trivial names based upon geographical terms and having the termination "-ensis"

Page

Document 18/1.—Proposition 15 submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at Paris in 1948. By PIERRE BONNET (*Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France*) 235

Document 18/2.—Proposal No. 15 of Prof. Bonnet. By LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO (*University of Parma, Italy*) 236

CASE No. 19

Article 16: proposed amplification of provisions relating to the formation of trivial names based upon geographical terms

Document 19/1.—Proposal submitted by PIERRE BONNET (*Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France*) 237

CASE No. 20

Article 20: proposed deletion from, of reference to diacritic marks[4]

Document 20/1.—Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 241

Document 20/2.—Statement furnished by the JOINT COMMITTEE ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE FOR PALEONTOLOGY IN AMERICA 243

Document 20/3.—Wiedergabe des skandinavischen å durch das Klassische Latein-Alphabet. By GERHARD REGNELL (*Paläontologisches Institut de Universität, Lund, Sweden*)... 244

---

[4] See also Case No. 5, especially Document D.5/17.

Page

Document 20/4.—Diacritic Marks. By J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 247

Document 20/5.—Letter dated 6th September 1952. From HENNING LEMCHE (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen*) 251

CASE No. 21

Article 20 : proposed amendment of concluding portion of " Recommandation "

Document 21/1.—Modification au dernier paragraphe de la *Recommandation* de l'Article 20 (Proposition 16). By PIERRE BONNET (*Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France*) 252

Document 21/2.—Proposal No. 16 of Prof. Bonnet, suggesting a modification to the last paragraph of the *Recommendation* to Article 20. By LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO (*University of Parma, Italy*) ... 253

CASE No. 22

Article 20 : proposed addition of a " Recommandation " deprecating the use of diphthongs in the printing of scientific names

Document 22/1.—Letter dated 24th January 1945. From E. B. FORD, M.A., D.Sc. (*Oxford University, Department of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy, Oxford*) 254

Document 22/2.—Extract from a letter dated 22nd January 1945 to E. B. Ford. From FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 254

Document 22/3.—Letter dated 23rd April 1951. From ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) 254

CASE No. 23

Article 21 : proposed clarification of a decision taken in 1948 regarding the circumstances in which a new name is to be attributed to an author other than that by whom the book or paper in which the new name was published is written

Page

Document 23/1.—Article 21 : problems in citation of authorship. By ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) 255

Document 23/2.—Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 256

CASE No. 24

Article 22 : proposed drafting amendment of, in the interests of consistency

Document 24/1.—Proposal submitted by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*... 259

CASE No. 25

Article 23 : authorship of a combination

Document 25/1.—Authorship of a combination. By ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) 261

CASE No. 26

Article 23 : proposed establishment of a method of citation in cases where a species is doubtfully referred to a given genus and where one species is doubtfully identified with another

Document 26/1.—Letter dated 20th March 1944 from LLOYD G. HENBEST (*United States Geological Survey, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 265

CASE No. 27

Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision that the distribution of a microfilm does not constitute "publication" of the paper reproduced in this manner and therefore that nothing contained in such a paper possesses any status in zoological nomenclature

Page

Document 27/1.—Adoption of a *Declaration* by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. Report by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the Commission*... 270

Document 27/2.—Extract from a letter dated 19th July 1952 from J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)... 275

CASE No. 28

Article 25 : proposed co-ordination with other parts of the "Règles" of the provision in, relating to the nomenclatorial status of books and papers, the manner of the issue of which does not satisfy the tests prescribed for "publication"

Document 28/1.—Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 276

Document 28/2.—Extract from a statement furnished by J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)... 277

CASE No. 29

Article 25, Provisos (a) and (c) : proposed redrafting in order to make it clear that, in order for a name to become available, it must be published with diagnostic characters

Document 29/1.—Proposal submitted by the COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE CHICAGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM 278

Page

Document 29/2.—On the difficulties encountered in prescribing a minimum standard for an "indication" for the purposes of Proviso (a) to Article 25. By FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 279

Annexe 1 : View expressed by J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 285

Annexe 2 : Proposal submitted by the COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK 286

Annexe 3 : Supplementary statement furnished by ERNST MAYR (*American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 288

Annexe 4 : View expressed by LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO (*University of Parma, Italy*) 288

CASE No. 30

Article 25, Provisos (a) and (c) proposed insertion of a provision denying availability in the case of the trivial name of any Fossil species unless at the time of the publication of that name there was published also a figure of the species in question

Document 30/1.—Proposal submitted by C. J. STUBBLEFIELD, D.Sc., F.R.S. (*Geological Survey and Museum, London*), L. R. COX, Sc.D., F.R.S. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*), and R. V. MELVILLE, M.A. (*Geological Survey and Museum, London*) 290

Document 30/2.—Articles 25 and 30 : proposed addition of *Recommandations* designed to promote the publication of figures whenever names are given to species or taxonomic units of lower rank and to ensure that, so far as possible, the species designated, indicated, or selected as the type species of genera shall be species for which figures have been published. By FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 292

CASE No. 31

Article 25 : question whether a name given to a nominal genus, the type specimen of the type species of which is a pathological monstrosity should be given any status of availability

Page

Document 31/1.—Proposal submitted by W. J. ARKELL, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. (*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge*) ... 295

Document 31/2.—Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 296

CASE No. 32

Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision that a name published by an author who made it clear that his object in so doing was some purpose other than that of providing a name for use in zoological nomenclature possesses no status of availability

Document 32/1.—Proposal submitted by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 297

CASE No. 33

Article 25 : question of the status to be accorded to generic names and trivial names published as " nomina nuda " in synonymies[5]

Document 33/1.—The general problem relating to the status to be accorded to zoological names published as *nomina nuda* in synonymies. By FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 299

Document 33/2.—Letter dated 16th November 1950 from J. E. COLLIN (*Newmarket, England*) 306

---

[5] See also Case No. 7.

Page

Document 33/3.—Letter dated 16th December 1950 from P. S. SYLVESTER-BRADLEY, B.Sc. (*University of Sheffield, England*) 309

Document 33/4.—Letter dated 16th December 1950 from W. J. ARKELL M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. (*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge*) 310

Document 33/5.—Letter dated 30th January 1951 from JOHN T. ZIMMER (*American Museum of Natural History, New York*) ... 311

Document 33/6.—Letter dated 5th February 1951 from GEORGE S. MYERS (*Natural History Museum, Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*) 312

Document 33/7.—Letter dated 13th February 1951 from ROUSSEAU H. FLOWER (*University of the State of New York, New York State Science Service, New York State Museum, Albany, N.Y., U.S.A.*) ... 313

Document 33/8.—The Status of *nomina nuda* listed in synonymy. By ERNST MAYR (*American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 315

Document 33/9.—Extracts from letters dated 23rd February 1951 and 30th July 1951 from HAROLD E. VOKES (*The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) 323

Document 33/10—Letters dated 28th February 1951 and 9th April 1952 from CHARLES H. BLAKE (*Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Biology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*) 326

Document 33/11.—Letter dated 14th March 1951 from BROOKS F. ELLIS (*Department of Micropaleontology, The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 328

Document 33/12.—Letter dated 29th March 1951 from J. MARVIN WELLER (*University of Chicago, Department of Geology, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 330

Document 33/13.—Views of workers at the BRITISH MUSEUM (NATURAL HISTORY), LONDON 331

Annexe 1 : Note by G. J. KERRICK 332

Page

Annexe 2 : Note by G. E. J. NIXON 332

Annexe 3 : Note by R. B. BENSON 332

Annexe 4 : Note by LESLIE BAIRSTOW 333

Document 33/14.—Comment upon a point raised by Professor Harold E. Vokes in a letter dated 23rd February 1951 (see Document 33/9). By ERNST MAYR (*American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 334

Document 33/15.—Generic Names published in Synonymies. By JOHN BALFOUR-BROWNE, M.A. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*) 335

Document 33/16.—Generic Names published in Synonymies. By G. H. E. HOPKINS, O.B.E., M.A. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *The Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*) 336

Document 33/17.—Statement dated 14th May 1952 furnished by TH. HALTENORTH (*Museum, München, Germany*) 337

Document 33/18.—Proposal submitted by the COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE CHICAGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM 338

Document 33/19.—Statement furnished by J. R. DYMOND (*University of Toronto, Department of Zoology, Toronto, Canada*) 339

Document 33/20.—Stellungnahme zu den Vorschlägen über den nomenklatorischen Status von Namen, die in Synonymien-Listen veröffentlich wurden. By ERICH M. HERING (*Abteilungsleiter am Zoologischen Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*) 339

Annexe : Views of Members of the Scientific Staff of the ZOOLOGISCHE SAMMLUNG DES BAYERISCHEN STAATES, MUNCHEN 340

Document 33/21.—Statement furnished by JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) 340

Document 33/22.—Statement of the views of the Scientific Staff of the ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM OF ZOOLOGY AND PALAEONTOLOGY, TORONTO, CANADA 341

Document 33/23.—Enclosure to a letter dated 1st July 1952 from A. MYRA KEEN and SIEMON W. MULLER (*Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*) 342

Page

Document 33/24.—Statement furnished by the COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK 343

Document 33/25.—Letter dated 18th July 1952 from C. W. WRIGHT (*London*) 344

Document 33/26.—Names published in Synonymy. By J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 345

Document 33/27.—Letter dated 20th July 1952 from HENNING LEMCHE (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen*) 347

Document 33/28.—Enclosure to a letter dated 22nd July 1952, from E. RAYMOND HALL (*University of Kansas, Department of Zoology, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) 347

Document 33/29.—Views of certain Members of the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY furnished by W. I. FOLLETT (*California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.*) 348

Annexe 1 : Note by HENRY TOWNES (*North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering of the University of North Carolina, Raleigh, North Carolina, U.S.A.*) 348

Annexe 2 : Views of ROBERT L. USINGER (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) 349

Annexe 3 : Views of JOHN T. ZIMMER (*American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 349

Document 33/30.—Generic names first published in synonymy. Statement of the views of certain members and former members of the COMMITTEE ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ICHTHYOLOGISTS AND HERPETOLOGISTS. Letter, dated 26th July 1952, with enclosures, from W. I. FOLLETT, *Chairman* 350

Enclosure 1 : Extract from a letter, dated 13th April 1952, from CHARLES M. BOGERT (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 350

Page

Enclosure 2 : Extract from a letter, dated 8th May 1952, from ARNOLD B. GROBMAN (*University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, U.S.A.*) 350

Enclosure 3 : Extract from a letter dated 23rd April 1952, from ROBERT RUSH MILLER (*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*) 351

Enclosure 4 : Extract from a letter, dated 16th April 1951, from HOBART M. SMITH (*University of Illinois, Department of Zoology, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 351

Document 33/31.—Generic names published in synonymy. Extract from a letter dated 20th August 1952, from W. E. CHINA, M.A., D.Sc. (*British Museum (Natural History), Department of Entomology, London*) 353

Document 33/32.—Extract from a letter dated 4th September 1952 by K. J. L. KEY (*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Division of Entomology, Canberra, Australia*) 353

Document 33/33.—Note by ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY, Ph.D., M.D. (*Department of Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) 354

CASE No. 34

Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision that a trivial name consisting of spelled-out letters or numerals shall not be accepted as available when those letters or numerals were originally employed as ordinals for the enumeration of the species, subspecies or infra-subspecific names concerned

Document 34/1.—Report on G. H. E. HOPKINS' proposal relating to trivial names consisting of spelled-out letters and numerals. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 355

CASE No. 35

Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision denying the status of availability to a trivial name inadvertently published as the result of the misreading of a previous publication or of a museum label or the like

Page

Document 35/1.—Letter dated 11th June 1951 by JAMES L. PETERS (*Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*) 357

Document 35/2.—Proposed denial of availability for trivial names inadvertently published through the misreading of a word written on a label or used in a book. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.B.E., C.M.G., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 358

CASE No. 36

Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision that certain classes of generic names published for fossil species and bearing the termination "-ites", "-ytes", or "-ithes" possess no status in zoological nomenclature

Document 36/1.—Proposals for the co-ordination of proposals submitted by L. R. COX for the rejection of certain classes of generic names published for fossil species and bearing the termination "-ites", "-ytes" or "-ithes" with a proposal submitted by J. WANNER for the automatic emendation from "-crinites" to "-crinus" of the terminations of generic names published for species of pelmatozoa. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 360

(1) L. R. COX's general proposal relating to generic names having the terminations " -ites ", " -ytes " and " -ithes " 361

(2) J. WANNER's proposal relating to the emendation to " crinus " of the termination " -crinites " in the case of generic names published for species of Pelmatozoa 361

(3) A combined proposal : proposals relating to names published for genera of fossils with the termination " -ites " 362

Page

Document 36/2.—Request for the suppression of certain generic names with the terminations " -ites ", " -ytes " and " -ithes " published by early authors for fossil genera. Enclosure to a letter dated 14th March 1949. By L. R. COX, M.A., Sc.D., F.R.S. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*) *London*) 363

Document 36/3.—" -crinites " or " -crinus " ? Communication by HENNING LEMCHE under cover of a letter dated 3rd January 1950. By J. WANNER (*Scheidegg/Algäu, Bavaria, Germany*) 367

Document 36/4.—Note dated 2nd January 1950 by TH. MORTENSEN (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen*)... 372

Document 36/5.—Comment by TORSTEN GISLEN (*Lunds Universitets Zoologiska Institution, Lund, Sweden*) 372

Document 36/6.—Extract from a letter dated 2nd June 1950 by RAYMOND C. MOORE (*University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) 373

CASE No. 37

Article 25, proviso (a) : proposed insertion of words to make it clear that a trivial name having as its indication only a qualified reference to a previously published trivial name does not satisfy the requirements of the foregoing proviso

Document 37/1.—Report on the adoption by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the adoption of a *Declaration* on the question of the availability of a trivial name having as its indication only a qualified reference to a previously published trivial name by FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*... 374

CASE No. 38

Article 28 : proposed restoration, in whole or in part, of the First Reviser principle

Document 38/1.—Introductory Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 376

Page

Document 38/2.—Extract from a letter dated 15th May 1952, from the COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE CHICAGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM 379

Document 38/3.—Letter dated 16th July 1952, from R. E. BLACKWLDER, *Secretary*. By THE NOMENCLATURE DISCUSSION GROUP, WASHINGTON, D.C. 380

Annexe : Proposed amendment to restore the rule of the First Reviser 380

Document 38/4.—Statement received on 18th July 1952. By RUDOLF RICHTER (*Natur-Museum und Forschungs-Institut, Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*)... 381

Document 38/5.—Letter dated 24th July, 1952 by HEMMING LEMCHE (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen*)... 384

Document 38/6.—Statement of the views of the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY. Letter, dated 27th July, 1952 from W. I. FOLLETT, *Chairman* ... 384

Appendix 1 : Memorandum and call for opinion issued to members of above-mentioned committee 385

Appendix 2 : Comments by members of the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY on the questions raised in the Memorandum of 4th July 1952 (reproduced in Appendix 1) 387

Enclosure 1 : Letter dated 8th July 1952, from L. M. KLAUBER (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) 387

Enclosure 2 : Extract from a letter, dated 15th July 1952, from ROBERT R. MILLER (*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*) 387

Enclosure 3 : Extract from a letter, dated 8th July 1952, from CURTIS W. SABROSKY (*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 387

Enclosure 4 : Extract from a letter, dated 9th July 1952, from JOHN W. WELLS (*College of Arts and Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 388

Page

Appendix 3 : Statement regarding a vote on The Rule of the First Reviser *versus* Page Precedence taken among the members of the SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY prepared by CHARLES D. MICHENER, when Chairman of the SOCIETY'S NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE 388

CASE No. 39

Article 30 : proposed insertion of a provision clarifying the question of the nominal species to be regarded as eligible for selection as the type species of a genus established without cited nominal species, in cases where a subsequent author, without citing such a species, gives a bibliographical reference to a work in which such a species is cited

Document 39/1.—Report on the adoption of a *Declaration* clarifying the position regarding the species to be regarded as eligible for selection as the type species of a nominal genus established with no cited nominal species. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 392

CASE No. 40

Article 30 : proposed amendment of the provisions relating to the procedure to be followed in dealing with nominal genera based, or alleged to have been based, upon misidentified type species

Document 40/1.—Proposal for an emendation to the action in regard to genera based upon misidentified type species taken at Paris and recorded on page 158 of volume 4 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* by J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 394

Document 40/2.—Note by FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 396

CASE No. 41

Article 30 : proposed clarification of rule (c)

Page

Document 41/1.—Request by ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY for the clarification in two respects of the rules in Article 30. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 397

CASE No. 42

Article 30, rule (f) (rule relating to the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which is published to replace an earlier name) : proposed introduction of words to make it clear that this rule applies only where a name is expressly published as a substitute for another name

Document 41/1.—Report on the adoption of a *Declaration* making it clear that rule (f) in Article 30 applies only to cases where one generic name is expressly published as a substitute for another. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 400

CASE No. 43

Article 30, rule (f) : proposed clarification of the position as regards the nominal species eligible to be the type species of two nominal genera, of which the name of one was published as a substitute for the other

Document 43/1.—Suggested emendation of Article 30, rule (f) (rule relating to the type species of two nominal, of which one name is published as a substitute for an earlier name) (enclosure to a letter dated 5th July 1951) by ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY, Ph.D., M.D. (*Department of Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) 402

Page

Document 43/2.—Support for ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY'S proposal for the clarifying of the position as to the nominal species eligible to be the type species of nominal genera under rule (f) in Article 30, together with a supplementary proposal in regard thereto. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 404

CASE No. 44

Article 30, rule (g) : proposed insertion of words to make it clear that the selection of a given structure exhibited by a specimen referred to a specified nominal species as typical of a given nominal genus does not constitute the selection of that species as the type species of that genus

Document 44/1.—Proposed clarification of an obscurity in rule (g) in Article 30. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 406

CASE No. 45

Article 30 : proposed repeal of the portion of rule (g) arising from the interpretation in " Opinion " 6

Document 45/1.—Extract from a letter, dated 21st November 1950, from WILLIAM GOSLINE (*University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii*) 409

Document 45/2.—Proposal by J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 410

CASE No. 46

Article 31 : proposed amendment of provisions relating to nominal species subjectively regarded by taxonomists as composite species

Document 46/1.—Article 31, as amended in 1948. Proposal received on 26th July 1952. By J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 411

CASE No. 47

Article 31 : proposed refinement of provisions relating to lectotypes

Page

Document 47/1.—Lectotypes : a paragraph in the *Règles* that needs some qualification. Proposal received on 26th July 1952. By J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 415

Document 47/2.—Extract from a letter dated 16th June 1952 from RICHARD MEINERTZHAGEN, D.S.O. (*London*) 417

CASE No. 48

Article 31 : suggested drafting amendments

Document 48/1.—Proposed amendment of Article 31 by J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 418

Annexe : Suggested amendments to the new Article or part of Article 31 agreed upon at Paris and recorded on pages 186—188 of Volume 4 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 420

CASE No. 49

Article 32 : proposed insertion of a provision for the rejection of a name on the ground of inappropriateness in certain circumstances

Document 49/1.—Letter dated 14th July 1951 by G. H. E. HOPKINS, O.B.E., M.A. (*British Museum (Natural History), The Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)... 421

CASE No. 50

Articles 34 and 35 : proposed addition of the consonantal " i " and the consonantal " j " and " yi " as forming a group of identical letters for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy

Page

Document 50/1.—Proposal of homonymy with the consonantal " i " at the consonantal letters " j " and " yi ". Enclosure to a letter dated 16th March 1949 from HOBART M. SMITH (*University of Illinois, Department of Zoology, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 422

CASE No. 51

Articles 34 and 35 : question whether two names consisting of words differing from one another in spelling only by the presence in the one case and by the absence in the other, of a diacritic mark over (or under) one of the letters of the word of which the names are composed are to be treated as homonyms of one another

Document 51/1.—Dr. HELEN MUIR-WOOD's request for a clarification of the provisions in Article 20 relating to the use of diacritic marks in relation to the Law of Homonymy. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 423

CASE No. 52

Articles 34 and 35 : proposed clarification of certain aspects of, in relation to names differing from one another only through the presence or absence of diacritic marks

Document 52/1.—Proposal by FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 425

CASE No. 53

Articles 34 and 35 : proposal that differences in spelling arising solely from differences in the manner in which the work forming the name has been transliterated into the Latin alphabet from some other alphabet should be ignored for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy

Page

Document 53/1.—Dr. HELEN MUIR-WOOD's proposal in regard to the treatment to be accorded under the Law of Homonymy to names differing from one another in spelling only by reason of the adoption of different methods for transliterating a word from the Cyrillic, or some other alphabet into the Latin alphabet. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 427

Document 53/2.—Letter dated 6th September 1953 by HENNING LEMCHE (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen*) 429

CASE No. 54

Articles 34 and 35 : proposal that differences in the spelling of names based upon barbarous words arising solely from the adoption of different methods for transcribing into the Latin alphabet the barbarous word concerned should be disregarded for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy

Document 51/1.—Proposal by FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 430

CASE No. 55

Article 35 : proposed insertion of a provision that for the purposes of establishing a condition of secondary homonymy between two specific names it is not necessary that an author should expressly cite the names in homonymous combinations before rejecting and replacing the later published of the two trivial names involved

Page

Document 55/1.—Report on the adoption of a *Declaration* clarifying the conditions necessary to establish a condition of secondary homonymy between any two specific names. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 432

CASE No. 56

Transcription of the Latin "v" (vowel) and "v" (consonantal) and of the Latin "i" (vowel) and "i" (consonantal)

Document 56/1.—Proposition 17 : ajouter à l'Appendice, un paragraphe "F" intitulé : transcription du "v" et du "i" latins. By PIERRE BONNET (*Université de Toulouse, France*)... 434

Document 56/2.—Statement received on 19th January 1948 : proposal 17 by Professor BONNET concerning the Latin letters "v" and "i". By LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO (*University of Parma, Italy*) 435

Document 56/3.—Comment on Professor Pierre Bonnet's proposition 17 concerning the orthography of scientific names. By JIRI PACLT (*Bratislava, Czechoslovakia*) 436

CASE No. 57

New article relating to the status of names published as the names of infra-subspecific forms : proposal to extend the period of grace before the new rules apply in their entirety to names published for taxonomic units below the species level but not clearly intended to apply to populations as contrasted with individual forms and other minority elements

Page

Document 57/1.—On the relation to the existing provisions regarding the status of names given to infra-subspecific forms of the proposal submitted on behalf of the Society of Systematic Zoology under cover of a letter dated 19th June 1952, from CHARLES D. MICHENER, then Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee of the above Society. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 438

Document 57/2.—Report furnished by CHARLES D. MICHENER, when Chairman of the COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY. Letter, dated 19th June 1952, from CHARLES D. MICHENER, communicated under cover of a letter dated 27th July 1952, by W. I. FOLLETT, Professor Michener's successor as chairman of the above Committee... 442

Enclosure to CHARLES D. MICHENER'S letter of 19th June 1952 : infra-specific Names 443

Document 57/3.—Extract from a letter dated 17th October 1952. By K. H. L. KEY (*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, Australia*) 445

CASE No. 58

Intra-subspecific names : proposal to withdraw recognition

Document 58/1.—NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY. Statement received under cover of a letter dated 27th July 1952, from W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman of the above Committee 446

Page
Annexe : infra-subspecific nomenclatural categories 446

Document 58/2.—Report by FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 448

CASE No. 59

Nomenclature of the specific complex

Document 59/1.—The nomenclature of the specific complex. By S. G. KIRIAKOFF, L.Sc. (*Zoological Museum, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium*) 450

CASE No. 60

Proposed substitution of the term " specific name " in place of the term " trivial name " for the second portion of a binominal combination

Document 60/1.—Statement furnished by the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK. Enclosure to a letter dated 18th July 1952 from ERNST MAYR 452

CASE No. 61

Proposed adoption of the adjective " nominate " in place of the adjective " nominotypical " to denote the subspecies of a polytypic species upon which the original description of that species was based

Document 61/1.—Proposal by the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK. Enclosure to a letter, dated 1st July 1952 from ERNST MAYR 454

CASE No. 62

Need for uniformity of rules of zoological nomenclature for the whole of the Animal Kingdom

Page

Document 61/1.—Report by the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY. Letter dated 27th July 1952 from W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman of the above Committee 455

Annexe : extent of uniformity of rules 456

CASE No. 63

Trend away from " automatic nomenclature "

Document 63/1.—Report by the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY. Letter dated 27th July 1952 from W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman of the above Committee 457

Annexe : trend away from " automatic nomenclature " 457

PART 3

PROPOSALS FOR BROADENING THE BASIS OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE, FOR THE FURTHER REGULATION OF ITS COMPOSITION, THE ELECTION OF ITS MEMBERS AND THEIR CONDITIONS OF SERVICE, AND THE PROCEDURE OF THAT BODY

CASE No. 64

Proposal for broadening the basis of the authority of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Document 64/1.—Statement submitted by the AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PARASITOLOGISTS 461

Document 64/2.—The present rules governing the size and composition of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, the election of its Members and its procedure. By FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*... 464

Annexe 1 : reproduction of Voting Paper V.P.(52) 47 relating to certain generic names in the Order Mallophaga (Class Insecta) 481

Annexe 2 : reproduction of Voting Paper V.P.(53) 4 relating to the generic names *Crangon* and *Alpheus* of Weber (1795) and Fabricius (1798) (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) respectively 484

CASE No. 65

Relationship between the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the International Congress of Zoology : proposed maintenance of existing arrangements

Page

Document 65/1.—Statement furnished by the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY (U.S.A.) 492

CASE No. 66

Question of the size of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Document 66/1.—Correspondence between HENNING LEMCHE (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen*) and FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* ... ...

(1) Letter dated 24th July 1952 from HENNING LEMCHE ... 494

(2) Letter dated 9th August 1952 from FRANCIS HEMMING ... 495

(3) Letter dated 6th September 1952 from HENNING LEMCHE ... 495

Document 66/2.—Historical background of the present regulations governing the size and composition of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 496

CASE No. 67

Qualifications to be looked for in candidates for election as members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and method to be adopted for elections to that body

Page

Document 67/1.—Proposal submitted by the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE CHICAGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM 497

Document 67/2.—Historical background to the present regulations in regard to the qualifications to be looked for in candidates for election as members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the method to be adopted for elections to that body. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zooogical Nomenclature*... 499

CASE No. 68

Period of service of members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Document 68/1.—Proposal submitted by the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE CHICAGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM ... 500

Document 68/2.—Historical background of the regulations at present in force for securing the due performance of their duties by individual members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 502

CASE No. 69

On the giving by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of advance notice of action proposed to be taken in particular cases

Page

Document 69/1.—Views expressed by members of the SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY (U.S.A.) 503

Document 69/2.—Procedure of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in the matter of giving of advance notice of action proposed to be taken in regard to particular problems. By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 505

PART 4

PROBLEMS AFFECTING THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

CASE No. 70

Copyright of the publications issued by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Document 70/1.—Statement furnished by the SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY (U.S.A.) 509

Document 70/2.—Extent to which, and conditions in which, documents published by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature may be quoted or reproduced in other publications. Statement issued on 8th June 1953 by the INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE 512

ADDENDUM

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO CASES NOS. 6 AND 53 RECEIVED TOO LATE FOR PUBLICATION PRIOR TO THE OPENING OF THE COLLOQUIUM ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE, COPENHAGEN, 1953, AND CONSIDERED BY THAT BODY IN MIMEOGRAPHED FORM

Page

Document 6/20.—Trivial names published partly as substitute names and partly as names for specified species or specified specimens. Report by FRANCIS HEMMING, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 519

Document 53/3—Request for a ruling that any two generic names or trivial names in the same genus, each based upon a word transliterated into the Latin alphabet from a language using another alphabet but differing from one another in the transliteration used, be treated as homonyms of one another. By TEISO ESAKI (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (Statement submitted on behalf of the National Sub-Committee on Zoological Nomenclature of the National Committee on Zoology, Science Council of Japan) 523

Corrigenda 526

Authors' Index 527

Particulars of dates of publication of the several Parts in which the present volume was published 531

Instructions to binders 533

VOLUME 10. Double Part 1/2
Pp. 1—60.

25th June, 1953

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

CHASED
0 JUN 1953

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

The problem of regulating the naming of Orders, Classes and other Taxonomic Categories above the Family level : a collection of papers submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

LONDON:
Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1953

Price Eighteen Shillings

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (*President*) (U.S.A.) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Peirre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (6th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : Colonel The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Parts 1/2 (pp. 1–60) 25th June 1953

EDITORIAL NOTE

The present volume contains the second instalment of the documents which have been collected for discussion this summer at Copenhagen, first, at the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature, and, second, at the meetings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology.

The first instalment of these documents has been published in volume 8 and comprises the documents relating to: (1) the promotion of stability and uniformity in zoological nomenclature (D.1 Series); (2) the question of the recognition of neotypes as a category of type specimen (D.2 Series); (3) the question of the reform of the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the naming of Families and other suprageneric categories (D.3 Series).

FRANCIS HEMMING
Secretary to the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.
15*th May*, 1953.

CASE NO. 4

DOCUMENTS RELEVANT TO THE CONSIDERATION OF THE PROBLEM OF REGULATING THE NAMING OF ORDERS, CLASSES AND OTHER TAXONOMIC CATEGORIES ABOVE THE FAMILY LEVEL

DOCUMENT 4/1

Origin of the present investigation

The present investigation into the problem of regulating the naming of Orders, Classes and other Taxonomic Categories above the Family level was undertaken in response to a request addressed to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at Paris in July, 1948, when, after giving preliminary consideration to applications submitted respectively by the late Mr. Edwin Ashby and the late Sir Sidney Harmer in regard to the names to be used for certain individual Classes (see Document 4/3), the International Commission agreed (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 385–386) :—

> "(1) to recommend that Commissioner Francis Hemming (Secretary to the Commission) should be invited to make a thorough study, in conjunction with interested specialists, of the problems involved in securing uniformity in the nomenclature of categories down to, and including, the Categories Order (*Ordo*) and Sub-Order (*Sub-Ordo*), and to submit a comprehensive Report thereon, with recommendations, to the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission of recommendations for the insertion in the *Règles* of comprehensive provisions dealing with this subject."

2. The foregoing recommendation, with other recommendations, was submitted to, and approved by, the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its Fifth Meeting held on 26th July, 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 107).

DOCUMENT 4/2

General consultation with specialists and issue of an appeal for advice in 1952

Editorial Note : Attention is drawn to the review prepared by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of the problems involved in the suggested regulation of the naming of Taxonomic Categories down to, and including, the Categories Order and Sub-Order which was published in March, 1952 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 95–108). This review contained an appeal to specialists to assist in the present investigation by furnishing statements of their views on the action which it was desirable should be taken. It was in response to this appeal that the majority of the documents now submitted was furnished.

DOCUMENT 4/3

Examples of competing names for Classes submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Note by the Secretary

Attention is drawn to two individual cases of competing names applied to the names of Classes which were brought to the attention of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature before the late World War and which, on being considered by the International Commission, jointly with the International Congress of Zoology in Paris in 1948, led to the decision that the present investigation of the question of regulating the naming of Orders and Higher Taxonomic Categories should be undertaken.

The applications relating to the foregoing cases were published in Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and it is only necessary here to give the references to the papers in question :

(*a*) Application, dated 13th June, 1933, submitted by the late Mr. Edwin Ashby (*Blackwood, South Australia*) on the relative merits of the names Polyplacophora and Loricara for the Class known as " Chitons " in the Phylum Mollusca (Ashby, 1946, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 176) ;

(*b*) Application, dated 1st February, 1938, by the late Sir Sidney Harmer (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*), submitted through the late Mr. W. L. Sclater (then *Chairman of the "Zoological Record" Committee of the Zoological Society of London*) on the subject of the relative merits of the names Bryozoa and Polyzoa (Harmer, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 230–231).

DOCUMENT 4/4

Suggestions by Pe. **JESUS MOURE,** CMF, *do Museu Paranaense e Universidade do Parana,* and **L. TRAVASSOS FILHO,** *do Departmente de Zoologia de Sao Paulo*

NAMES FOR TRIBES AND SUB-TRIBES

In a paper entitled *Notas sobre a Nomenclatura dos Grupos superiores a Generos* published in November 1947 by the *Museu Paranaense* (*Publicoes Avulsas* No. 4), the above authors suggest that the basic principles for securing uniformity in the nomenclature of groups above the genus level should include the adoption of the termination "-ini" for the names of Tribes and of the termination "-ina" for the names of Sub-Tribes. See the Summary annexed to the above paper reproduced as Document No. 3/7 in the series of papers relating to the naming of Families.

DOCUMENT 4/5

Resolution adopted at the Final Plenary Session of the

CONGRESO CIENTIFICO MEXICANA, 1951

Letter, dated 29th October, 1951, from

LIC. JESUS SILVA HERZOG, Presidente, Comision Ejecutiva del Congreso

En le sesión de resoluciones y clausura del Congreso Científico Mexicana fue aprobada una proposición presentada por la Sección de Zoología del mencionado Congreso, concebida en los siguientes términos :

" La Sección de Zoología del Congreso Científico Mexicano propone : 1o.—Que todos los nombres zoológicos *ordinales* tengan una terminación uniforme que permits reconocer en cualquier nombre que la lleve su valor taxonómico, y 2o.—Que en caso de que el primer punto sea aceptado se estudie la posibilidad de emplear como destinencia característica la terminación—*informes*, ya adoptada en algunos groupos zoológicos."

En nombre de la Comisión Ejecutiva del Congreso Científico Mexicano, me permito comunicar a usted esta resolución, agradeciendo desde ahora la atención que se sirva darle.

DOCUMENT 4/6

By **LEONARD P. SCHULTZ**
(*Smithsonian Institution, United States National Museum,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

Letter, dated 26th September, 1951, with enclosure

I received in this morning's mail from Mr. W. I. Follett, copies of correspondence concerning the subject of nomenclature of Suborders, Orders, and higher categories. As soon as I have time to work this over, I will send Mr. Follett my comments. In the meantime, I wish to call to your attention that I have assembled some data on this subject through a preliminary survey of some of the North American zoologists. These data were published in *Science*, **113** : 655–657, 1951. I have no reprints of the article but I am enclosing a single copy that was given to me.

I observed in assembling data on this subject that it is just as necessary (if not more so) to fix the endings of the categories below the Orders as it is to fix the endings of the Orders themselves. I urge you to consider the whole scheme of classification and not to confine your attention to Super-Orders, Orders, and Sub-Orders, etc. There is just as much need for fixing Tribe endings as there used to be for fixing Family endings. Perhaps you could give this some thought and write as soon as convenient to Mr. Follett.

Annexe

RESULTS OF A PRELIMINARY SURVEY OF GROUP ENDINGS IN ZOOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATIONS ABOVE THE CATEGORY OF GENUS

(Portion of a paper published in *Science*, **113** : 655–657, 1951)

Late in 1948 the author inquired of twenty-seven North American ichthyologists in regard to fixing specific endings for various categories of classification. Replies were favourable. In order to obtain information on a broader basis, during the early part of 1949 specialists in the fields of carcinology, entomology, herpetology, ichthyology, invertebrate zoology, malacology, ornithology, mammalogy, paleontology, and parasitology, were consulted. Entomologists and ornithologists have, to a certain extent, already adopted endings for various Groups of classification. After discussions with about twenty specialists in the various fields, and knowing that numerically entomologists nearly outnumber the specialists in all other fields together, it was decided to follow the endings as already used by entomologists from Superfamily down through Subtribe, but to follow ornithologists for the ending of an Order (-iformes) and for Sub-Order (-oidei) as used by certain vertebrate zoologists, both minorities, for the purpose of stirring up discussions and inviting comments. The results were interesting and valuable.

Somewhat as an afterthought the idea of a type genus was added to the circular letter sent out. This was an error, since it was misunderstood by a sizable percentage, who did not distinguish the type genus concept from the entirely separate concept of stabilisation of group endings.

The author sent out the circular letter to over 700 North American systematic zoologists on the mailing list of the Society of Systematic Zoology and received 445 ballots in return. This circular proposed to fix the endings of Groups above the level of the genus, and results were as follows :

Number of votes cast concerning proposed endings used in groups of classification

Field	Votes	Order -iformes	Sub-Order -oidei	Super-family -oidea	Super-Tribe -idi	Tribe -ini	Sub-Tribe -ina	Type genus	Unanimous ballots	Total ballots* returned
Carcinology	For	12	17	19	18	19	19	16	11	23
	Against	11	6	4	5	4	4	7	2	
Entomology	For	51	73	155	140	154	127	80	41	159
	Against	106	84	3	13	4	15	68	2	
Harpetology	For	24	24	29	26	27	26	19	17	30
	Against	5	6	—	2	1	2	8	—	
Ichthyology	For	37	39	39	38	39	38	38	32	41
	Against	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	—	
Invertebrate Zoology	For	30	31	36	38	38	37	30	25	50
	Against	12	17	12	9	9	10	12	7	
Malacology	For	10	11	16	13	13	13	10	7	17
	Against	7	6	1	3	3	3	7	—	
Ornithology	For	25	21	25	21	22	21	15	13	25
	Against	—	4	—	2	1	2	9	—	
Mammalogy	For	18	28	35	29	30	32	26	16	36
	Against	18	6	—	5	4	2	9	—	
Paleontology	For	10	10	20	19	17	14	12	7	29
	Against	17	17	7	8	10	13	15	5	
Parasitology	For	29	33	34	31	33	31	29	24	35
	Against	6	2	1	3	2	3	5	—	
Totals	For	246	287	408	373	392	358	275	193	
	Against	185	150	29	51	39	55	141	16	445
GRAND TOTAL		431	437	437	424	431	413	416	209	
Per cent.	For	57.1	65.7	93.3	88.0	91.0	86.7	66.1		
	Against	42.9	34.3	6.7	12.0	9.0	13.3	33.9		

* Some ballots did not have votes on every item.

The following information is summarised from comments received on about half of the ballots returned : "A wonderful idea and attempt to advance stability of zoological nomenclature" ; " Leave nomenclature alone and get back to the study of specimens."

Order -iformes : Too long ; not widely used, preferable not to disturb ordinal and subordinal endings in such groups as entomology, mammalogy and herpetology since these are so well known they are already fixed by usage ; ordinal names should not be changed except for reasons of concept ; let each group of specialists for each class of animals decide for themselves what ending should be used.

Suborder : Little or no comment.

Superfamily : Little or no comment.

Supertribe, tribe, subtribe : These categories are used in the most complicated groups of species, mostly in insects, fishes and crustacea. Some individuals voted against these categories because they did not use or need them in their own specialty. A sizable majority want the endings for these categories fixed for all time. Mary Rathbun in crustaceans was the only one mentioned using these groups above the family level.

The following is a summary of nomenclatorial comments on group endings :

(1) Against retroactive action, basic idea stability, not uniformity; (2) *-idi* and *-ini* too much like *-idae* and *-inae* in sound when pronounced; (3) *-ina* and *-ini* conflict when same ending occurs for a genus ; (4) endings of higher categories should be selected grammatically ; (5) *unanimous against* in the table, 16 ballots, indicates disapproval of any change and a misunderstanding of the type genus concept. It was observed that several of the *unanimous against* ballots came from individuals who had worked in a narrow specialty for a long time ; (6) *unanimous for* in the table, 193 ballots, indicates a willingness to go along with any change that will stabilise nomenclature, and they think that the type genus concept including super-family can be worked out with a great contribution toward stability, including superfamily, but not above that category ; (7) Advantageous to have characteristic fixed endings for each category of classification of animals, and stabilize names all the way down from Kingdom ; (8) Let law of priority fix all cases, discard all official lists ; (9) Premature action and lack of polling zoologists, lack of effective conservanda system has invalidated whole present code of zoological nomenclature, new rules are a bar to progress.

The following is a summary of comments in regard to the type genus concept. The author feels his presentation was too short, not clearly stated, therefore it was misunderstood by a sizable number of systematists. Ending and the type genus were intended to be two separate concepts. In spite of the obvious confusion 66.1 per cent. would fix a type genus through the Superfamily. (1) Type genus of any Family must be type genus of all lower categories to which it belongs zoologically ; (2) establishment of type genus for any category below Family, constitutes establishment of type genus for all categories below to which it belongs zoologically. (3) Each type genus serving as the stem for group names should be selected on basis of : (*a*) family of world-wide distribution ; (*b*) known in all lands, common, important, famous ; (*c*) typical of the Order or Group ; (*d*) recent, if possible, then fossil ; (*e*) priority alone not to be considered except in case of controversy ; (*f*) committee of eleven specialists should represent each class and be international in scope, not more than two members from each country, and sub-committees set up for Orders or Families if desirable ; (*g*) type genus must not be based on a homonym. (4) Should follow law of priority. (5) Group names should be based on older names instead of selecting new ones. (6) For each class print a tentative list and distribute same to all working systematists in each class and five years later reprint with all corrections after which date this becomes the *official list* and fixes all Group names. (7) Use synonyms of a valid genus for Family names if already in wide use. (8) Fixing of the genotype has cleared up most genera, and it would do so for Families and Tribes. (9) Genotype for type genus should be (*a*) illustrated, based on oldest included genus, following concept of first revision ; (*b*) all decisions to be based on already established nomenclatorial rules.

The results of this survey were presented at the June 1950 scientific meeting in Salt Lake City and several zoologists urged that an extensive international survey should be undertaken on a basis of revised endings which are herein outlined. The author, on 21st February, 1950, presented the results of the survey to the Nomenclatorial Discussion Group in Washington, D.C., and a committee was appointed with the author as chairman for the purpose of investigating the matter further. Representatives of the major fields listed above acted on the committee. They are : F. A. Chace, B. G. Chitwood, G. A. Cooper, H. M. Friedman, E. R. Hall, D. H. Johnson, E. A. Lachner, R. C. Moore, H. A. Redher, E. G. Reinhard, C. W. Sabrosky, H. B. Stenzel, and W. Stickle.

Various endings for categories above the genus have been proposed and considered by the above listed committee and again by about forty systematic zoologists at Salt Lake City in June 1950. They are as follows :

		AAAS Pearse Committee	B. G. Chitwood	J. W. Durham and R. C. Moore	L. P. Schultz	H. B. Stenzel	
Order	super	-ida		-ida		-ica	Neuter
	main	-ida	-ida	-ida	-iformes	-ida	
	sub	-ina	-ina	-ina	-oidei	-ina	
Family	super		-oidea	-oidae	-oidea	-icae	feminine
	main		-idae	-inae	-idae	-idae	
	sub		-inae	-inae	-inae	-inae	
Tribe	super				-idi	-ici	masculine
	main		-idi		-ini	-idi	
	sub		-ini		-ina	-ini	

The most logical system of endings was proposed by H. B. Stenzel and published in *Science*, **112**, no. 2899, p. 94, 21st July, 1950. Stenzel's plan of endings is logical and aids memory by having two letters of each ending repeated in each comparable group : super-, main-, and sub-. A further memory aid is the suggested use of the neuter, -*a*, for endings of Superorder, Order and Sub-Order ; feminine, -ae, for Superfamily, Family, and Sub-Family, and masculine, -*i*, for endings of Supertribe, Tribe, and Sub-Tribe. These endings are short and conform closely to the endings for Family and Sub-Family already adopted in zoological nomenclature. Ichthyologists at the meeting of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists on 22nd June, 1950, at Salt Lake City, voted unanimously to follow the Stenzel system of endings as proposed. Since there was a very definite opinion not to alter endings for Orders and Sub-Orders in certain fields, but the opinion was very strong for fixing uniform endings for Superfamily on down through the Sub-Tribe, it was recommended that a new ballot be sent out.

DOCUMENT 4/7

By **G. H. E. HOPKINS, O.B.E., M.A.** (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts.*)

Enclosure to letter dated 13th March, 1952

THE POSSIBLE ADDITION TO THE "RÈGLES" OF PROVISIONS GOVERNING THE NAMING OF ORDERS AND HIGHER TAXONOMIC CATEGORIES

If any addition to the *Règles* of provisions governing the naming of taxonomic categories higher than the family is to be made (as seems to be desirable), it is extremely important that the problem should be approached with great caution or we are liable to find large numbers of familiar names disappearing as junior synonyms or as junior homonyms.

Because two rival names are in common use for the Order comprising the fleas, and because the principle of priority had been invoked in favour of one of them, I undertook an investigation into the question what would be the correct name of the Order if the principle of priority were to be applied to the names of Orders and higher taxonomic categories. The results were complicated by several undecided nomenclatorial questions, but as my findings have been published in full (Hopkins, 1951, *Entomologist* 84 : 208-214) and as the case is only being mentioned here as an example, it seems justifiable to simplify it by assuming that the Commission would decide doubtful points in the way that seems to me to be probable. Making this assumption, and remembering that I was concerned only with the name of the fleas and therefore made no attempt to follow up any side-lines, the following facts emerged from my enquiry :—

(i). Neither of the rival Ordinal names (Siphonaptera and Aphaniptera) which, between them, are applied to the fleas by more than 90% of present-day zoologists is the senior name for the Order, nor is Suctoria, which has been revived (after long disuse) by one eminent entomologist in the vain hope of thus settling the controversy but which has not been taken up by any other author. The oldest name for the fleas is Aptera Linnè 1758, originally composite but restricted to this Order by Leach in 1815, this restriction being far earlier than that of Shipley (1904) to another Order of insects. The name does not appear to have been used for the fleas by any author since Leach, but is sometimes used for the Order to which Shipley restricted it, also known as the Thysanura.

(ii). The next two most senior names for the fleas are Saltatoria and Suctoria, both dating from Retzius (1783) and published on the same page but the former with " page precedence " and possibly not to be regarded as an Ordinal name. Both these names are in current general use for taxonomic categories other than the fleas, the former for one of the main divisions of the Orthoptera and the latter for a group of the Protozoa, but in both cases their application to the fleas is much earlier.

(iii). There are two more names senior to Siphonaptera and Aphaniptera (both of which are relatively late), but as these are neither senior synonyms for the Order comprising the fleas, nor senior homonyms of names in current use for other taxonomic categories, they need not be mentioned. The only two names that have been in anything approaching general use for the fleas during the last hundred years are Siphonaptera and Aphaniptera. Most of the other names have either only been used once or twice for this Order, or almost exclusively by a single author.

Summarising my findings, the enquiry into this one small problem has shown that, assuming the application of the principle of priority to names of Orders and higher taxonomic categories to be adopted, not only both the rival names in common use for the fleas, but also two other names in general use (and a third that is sometimes used) for other large taxonomic units in zoology would be invalid, the two names for the fleas as junior synonyms and the other names as junior homonyms of names previously applied to the fleas. It seems possible that this state of affairs may be frequent in connection with the names of taxonomic units higher than the family.

In my opinion, the only way to avoid chaos is to ensure that any provisions governing the naming of Orders and higher taxonomic categories should not be retrospective but apply only to names given after the new provisions come into force. With regard to names already given, specialists on each Class should be requested to draw up a list of names in general use, and these (together with their type families) should be published in the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* for criticism. I have little doubt that there would be general agreement on the vast majority of the names, particularly if it is carefully explained in the request that in drawing up the lists only the question of what names are in general use (not whether these names are technically valid or not) should be considered. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should be empowered to place undisputed names on an Official List and to adjudicate with regard to the remainder.

DOCUMENT 4/8

By **L. B. HOLTHUIS**
(Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands)

Letter dated 15th April, 1952

As far as I can see the nomenclature of Orders and higher taxonomic categories is in such a disorder, that it will be hardly possible to fix rules as to the nomenclature of these categories without upsetting a lot of well-known names or without having to make a very large number of exceptions to these rules. Since the number of scientific names of Orders and higher taxonomic units is rather restricted, I am wondering whether it would be possible to set up a Commission of zoologists, who have an interest in the taxonomy of higher groups in the Animal Kingdom, to make, in consultation with specialists of the various groups, an " Official List of Names of Orders and Higher Taxonomic Categories in Zoology ", which should contain the scientific names of all categories which at present are currently accepted. This commission has to make out : (1) which names should be used for the various categories and in what spelling, (2) who is the author of each name, (3) what should be considered the date of publication of the name, (4) what is the type unit of each category. It is advisable that this commission in making this list should be guided by the principles laid down in your paper (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7 (4) : 95–108), but that they have the right to deviate from these principles.

After the publication of this List, the scientific names, the author's names, the dates of publication and the type indications given in it should have to be accepted as correct. All the names of Orders and higher taxonomic categories not included in this list and published before the date of publication of this list should be regarded as not having been published at all. To the names of Orders and higher categories inserted in the list and those published after the date of publication of the list, the law of priority should be applied.

What is not possible with trivial, generic, and even family names, namely, to make a complete official list, seems to me to be very well realisable here, since the number of Orders and higher taxonomic categories is not too large. Most textbooks go down to the level of the Order. Pearse's " Zoological Names. A List of Phyla, Classes and Orders " (Durham, 1949) even lists all names down to Sub-Orders. A complete Official List of Orders and higher Categories in Zoology will enable us to make a fresh start without upsetting a lot of well-known names.

DOCUMENT 4/9

Suggestions furnished by **FRANZ DANIEL**

(*Zoologische Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, München, Germany*)

Editorial Note : Attention is drawn to the comprehensive scheme for promoting stability in zoological nomenclature set out by Dr. Franz Daniel (*Zoologische Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, München*) in a letter dated 30th April, 1952, which has been reproduced as Document 1/25 in the series of documents relating to the stability problem, since that scheme contemplated, *inter alia*, that the names of Orders and higher taxonomic categories should be stabilised through the designation of types by agreement among specialists in the groups concerned.

DOCUMENT 4/10

By Th. HALTENORTH (*Museum, München, Germany*)

Statement, dated 14th May, 1952, communicated by
Professor E. M. HERING

III. Einverstanden. Bei B.1 und B.14 is Fassung (a) zu bevorzugen.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The foregoing comment was prepared by Dr. Haltenorth in response to an invitation by Professor E. M. Hering who had prepared the following synopsis of the problems at issue for consideration by German zoologists. It is to this document that the numbers cited by Dr. Haltenorth refer.

III. Vorschläge für Einordnung der Ordnungen and höherer Kategorien in die " Regeln "

A. Problem : Die " Regeln " geben keine Vorschläge und Vorschriften für die Behandlung dieser Kategorien. Aufzunehmende Vorschriften müssen *mehr Rücksicht auf Stabilität als auf Uniformität* nehmen.

B. Verschläge für die neuen Vorschriften.

1. Kennzeichnung der Ordnung durch *typische Familie* oder bei Fehlen einer selchen durch typische Gattung. Wird die Ordnung später in Familien auf geteilt, muss das typische Genus in die typische Familie gestellt werden.

   Oder: es ist *vorzuschreiben ein typisches Genus*, das auch später typisches Genus jeder untergeordneten Kategorie werden muss.

2. Die *Endung* kann aus Gründen der Stabilität *nicht uniform* sein. Man könnte vorschreiben, dass die Engung der in der zugehörigen Klasse üblichen ontspricht, dann ergeben sich Schwierigkeiten, wenn die Ordnung in andere Klasse versetzt wird.

3. *Koordinierung* von Ordnungs-Namen mit denen *untergeordneter Kategorien* oberhalb der Familie. Ob auch wohl mit denen der Klassen ?

4. *Anerkennung einer Ordnungsbezeichnung* soll analog den in II für die Familien festgelegten Prinzipien erfolgen. Mit Inkraftsetzung der neuen Regeln nur noch mit Familien-Typus ; wenn vorher, schon als Ordnung bezeichnet und etwa vor 1950 geformt, dann Sonderbehandlung durch INK.

5. *Prioritätsgesetz* wird nicht gefordert für das 1 Jahrhundert nach 1758, soll aber für alle nach der Neufassung der " Regeln " aufgestellten massgeblich sein.

6. *Emendierungs*-Vorschriften die gleichen wie für die Familien.

7. *Nominotypische Bezeichnungen* für Unterordnungen, Unterklassen und Subphyl vom Stamm der Ordnungsbezeichnung sind unerwünscht, da Stabilität der Namen dadurch stark gefährdet würde.

8. *Citation:* Autor und Datum sellen den Ordnungs-pp. Bezeichnungen hinzugefügt werden, wenn Aufnahme der Vorschriften in die " Regeln " erfolgen sollte.

9. *Homonymie* bei Ordnungsnamen (z.B. Decapoda bei Crustaceen und Cephalopoden Vorschlag :

   (*a*) Wenn die Homonymie bereits vor Neufassung der Regeln besteht, soll INK. entscheiden.

   (*b*) Wenn die ältere Bezeichnung vor, die jüngere nach Inkraftsetzung der neuen Regeln gebildet, und wenn

   (*c*) beide nach der Neufassung gebildet wurden, ist der jüngere Name zu verwerfen.

10. *Nomonymie* zwischen *Genus-und Ordnungsnamen*. Opinion 102 hatte bestimmt, dass Homonymie zwischen beiden nie bestehen kann. Es sollen aber künftig keine Gattungsnamen gebildet werden, die schon als Ordnungsnamen Verwendung fanden, wenigstens nicht für Gattungen in der betreffenden Ordnung. (Xyphosura in Ordn. Zypnosura !) Neubildungen in Gattungen and Ordnungen können bereits bestehende Namen nicht ungültig machen.

11. *Koordinierung* und gleiche Behandlung von Ordnungen, Klassen und Phylen.

12. Wenn Ordnungen und *höhere Kategorien vom gleichen Stamm* gebildet sind und sich nur in der Endung unterscheiden, soll keine Namenänderung erfolgen.

13. Schaffung einer " *Offiziellen Liste* " und eines " *Offiziellen Index* " für Ordnungen und höhere Kategorien analog den schon bestehenden Listen für Gattungs-und Artnamen (Nomina conservanda und verworfene Namen).

14. Allgemeiner Vorschläg :

    (*a*) In die Regeln werden Vorschrift über Anwendung des Prioritätsgesetze vorgeschrieben, wo Namensänderung oder -Beibehaltung ihnen entgegen gefordert wird, kann beides auf Spezialisten durch INK. erfolgen, oder

    (*b*) Es werden ähnliche Regeln geschaffen, aber ohne Gesetz der Priorität und Zwang zur nominotypischen Familienbezeichnung, und auf Antrag des Spezeialisten bestimmt in umstrittenen Fällen INK. Namen und Typenbezeichnung.

DOCUMENT 4/11

By **W. J. ARKELL,** M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.

(*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge*)

Extract from a letter dated 23rd May, 1952

I have read with admiration your most thorough and clear papers in the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : Parts 1–6.

. . . . On Z.N.(S.)360 (Ordinal Names), I have no comments, and I should be content to see these matters go through as expounded in your paper.

DOCUMENT 4/12

By **J. R. DYMOND**

(*University of Toronto, Department of Zoology, Toronto, Canada*)

Statement received on 27th May, 1952

I approve the suggestion in Vol. 7 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* that provisions relating to the name of Orders and Higher Taxonomic Categories be inserted in the *Règles*.

I consider it necessary that each nominal Order be provided with a " type " which shall be irremovable from that Order and constitute the sole means by which the Order shall be identified.

I consider that either of the suggestions for the designation of a " type " would be satisfactory but prefer the second, namely (i) that every nominal Order must have a " type genus " and (ii) that the " type genus " of an Order shall also be the " type genus " of each successive nominotypical sub-unit (e.g., infra-Order, sub-Order, etc.) into which the Order concerned may be divided.

I believe it desirable to provide for uniformity of termination of Ordinal names within particular groups where this is in accordance with the wishes of specialists in the group concerned.

I believe it to be impracticable to apply the principles of priority for the purpose of determining the relative status of all Ordinal names.

I recommend that the scheme relating to Ordinal and co-ordinate names should provide that the emendation of such names shall be subject to the same conditions and procedure as that prescribed for family names.

It is unwise in the interest of stability to introduce a rule that the name of the nominotypical sub-Order of an Order should be tautonymous with or even necessarily based upon the same word as the name of the Order concerned.

The practice of citing the name of the author and the date of publication of Ordinal names should be formally recognised by the *Règles* as correct.

A stop should be put to homonymy as between Ordinal names. It is suggested that where a situation of homonymy is found to exist as between two Ordinal or other nomenclatorially co-ordinate names, each published prior to the introduction of the revised scheme, the question which of the names in question is to be rejected in favour of the other is to be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision.

It is suggested that, for the purpose of determining whether any two Ordinal or other co-ordinate names consisting of very similar but not identical words are to be treated as homonyms of one another, the provision recommended for family names should be applied.

Classes and Phyla should be provided with types.

I can see no valid reason for prohibiting the use of the same word as the base of names belonging to successive taxonomic categories.

Provision should be made for establishing an Official List of the names of Orders and Higher Taxonomic Categories in Zoology.

To avoid extensive changing of names on the inclusion in the *Règles* of regulations for the naming of Orders, Classes and Phyla, I suggest that the Commission be authorised on the application of specialists to determine the names to be accepted as valid and to prescribe the type to be accepted for the purpose of providing the unit so named with an objective concept.

DOCUMENT 4/13

By **S. G. KIRIAKOFF,** L.SC.
(*Zoological Museum, Ghent University, Belgium*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 5th June, 1952

COMMISSION'S REF. Z.N.(S.)360. NAMING OF ORDERS AND HIGHER TAXONOMIC CATEGORIES (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7 : pt. 4, pp. 95–130)

I agree with the contents of the above paper.

Regarding paragraph **19**, I would prefer alternative No. 2.

I suggest that there be uniformity in termination of Ordinal names within each class.

I suggest that in the class Insects the terminations of Ordinal names be : "-ptera ".

Regarding paragraph **7**, I think that a co-ordination of Ordinal names with sub-Ordinal ones would necessitate too many changes (at least as far as Insects are concerned).

Annexe

APPENDIX TO ANSWERS TO INQUIRY

Comm. ref. Z.N.(S.)357 and 360

Great as would be the improvement if and when the provisions proposed in your inquiries labelled Commission's ref. Z.N.(S.)357 (Family names) and 360 (Ordinal names) were to be accepted by the forthcoming Zoological Congress, these provisions still remain incomplete. There is, indeed, a gap left between the Sub-Order and the Superfamily. In many cases, the need for a taxonomic category which is intermediate between the two latter is not felt ; but there are cases where it is. So, for instance, in my Classification of the Lepidoptera and Related Groups, I have been led to use the cohortal group of taxonomic categories, including the supercohors, the cohors and the subcohors, because the use of Superfamilies alone would have been quite inadequate to express the nearer relations between the various phyletic stems and branches, each consisting of one or more Superfamilies.

I believe the *Règles* should provide for such cases, because, as I know, there are specialists who hesitate to use those taxonomic categories which they believe to be " illegal ". If there is any necessity to provide for the legalisation of the superfamilial, tribal, and other higher categories, the same necessity exists, I think, where the cohortal group is concerned.

I therefore ask you whether it would be possible to extend the purport of the proposed improvements to the cohorts, including the categories just above and below the latter, i.e. the supercohorts and the subcohorts. As you will see from my paper referred to above, I have used for supercohorts and cohorts descriptive Greek names terminating with the indication of a part of the body ("-ptera ", "-poda " ; other terminations could be "-stomata ", "-cephala ", "-ura " and so on), and for subcohorts the stem of the typical Superfamily name terminating with "-iformes ".

DOCUMENT 4/14

By **ERICH M. HERING**

(*Abteilungsleiter am Zoologischen Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*)

Statement received on 7th June, 1952

STELLUNGNAHME ZU DEN VORSCHLÄGEN ZUR EINFÜHRUNG VON VORSCHRIFTEN ÜBER DIE BENENNUNG DER ORDNUNGEN UND HÖHEREN KATEGORIEN IN DIE " RÈGLES "

Der Zoologen-Stab des Zoologischen Museums der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin unterstützt die in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 7, pt. 4, pp. 95–108 ausgeführten Vorschläge mit 14 von 14 Stimmen.

Es soll in die *Règles* eine Vorschrift über die Anwendung des Prioritätsgesetzes aufgenommen werden, aber die International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature soll die Vollmacht erhalten, zum Zwecke der Erhaltung der Stabilität auf Antrag der Spezialisten in gewissen Fällen auch gegen das Prioritätsgesetz Entscheidungen zu treffen.

Annexe to statement furnished by Professor E. M. Hering

Views of Dr. WALTER FORSTER

(*Zoologische Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, München, Germany*)

Dr. Walter Forster von der Zoologischen Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates in München teilt mit, dass der Stab der befragten Zoologen am Museum München sich in gleichem Sinne mit 11 von 12 Stimmen für die Unterstützung entschieden hat.

DOCUMENT 4/15

By **JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr.** (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

Statement received on 24th June, 1952

A species is an entity which exists in nature. When two people speak of the same species they speak of the same thing, and in order that they may use the same name for the same thing rules and regulations are indispensible.

Genera do not exist in nature, but in the mind. They are conceptions, not objects. But since the generic name is part of the specific name and therefore always included in it, the rules governing specific names must also govern generic names.

Since family names are derived from generic names, a case could be made out for extending the rules to govern family names as well ; these is no particular objection to this, provided that the rules are so formulated that they do not cause confusion by being applied.

But there is no reason for the application of rules to categories of higher rank than that of superfamily. The significance of such names is subjective and not objective, and it is clear that the author of such a name will have a clearer idea of what it denotes than a commission whose interpretation of it is not direct, but derived indirectly through the application of rules. If an author sets up a group which subsequent study shows to be an unnatural one, it would be better to abandon its name altogether, rather than to attempt to preserve it as the name of a new group with different limits which may or may not contain some of the same genera in the group originally defined.

The names *Cryptobranchia* and *Asthenodonta* have each been applied to a suborder and a genus ; it would seem to me wiser not to formulate a rule that would automatically decide in favour of either use, but to rule that anyone encountering a similar instance should report the same to the Commission and request a decision by suspension of the rules under the plenary power now held by the Commission.

DOCUMENT 4/16

Statement of the views of the

SCIENTIFIC STAFF OF THE ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, TORONTO, CANADA

Enclosure to a letter, dated 26th June, 1952, from
Dr. F. A. URQUHART, *Director*

(For the text of the above letter, see Document 1/39)

COMMISSION'S REFERENCE Z.N.(S.) 360

We unanimously agreed that every nominal Order must have a type genus and that the type genus of an Order shall also be the type genus of each successive nominotypical sub-unit into which the Order concerned may be divided.

We unanimously agreed with your suggestion as put forward in paragraph 13, page 103, of volume 7, part 4.

We unanimously agreed that, like Orders, higher categories should be provided with types, which presumably would normally be, in the first case, type Orders and, in the second case, type Classes, for, like a nominal Order, a nominal Class or a nominal Phylum remains indeterminate until it has been provided with a type, by means of which its content for nomenclatorial purposes alone be defined.

We unanimously agreed to the suggestion set forth in alternative No. 2 as described by you in paragraph **19**, page 107, of volume 7, part 4 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*.

Suggestion.

After considerable discussion we felt that it was most unfortunate that many names of Orders bear little significance to the objects contained within that Order. For instance, in the field of entomology there are such names as " Lepidoptera " which means scaly-winged. Entomologists are well aware of the fact that there are many kinds of insects not belonging to this Order that possess scaly wings. Another good example is the Order name " Hymenoptera ". There are many kinds of insects belonging to many Orders which would fit into the description as given by this name. We find similar erroneous suggestions in the Order names in Ichthyology, Ornithology, Mammalogy and Herpetology. We therefore would like to offer the following suggestion, realising as we do the difficulties that would arise if such a suggestion were put forward :

In view of the fact that we select a definite species to act as the type for a genus, that we take the type genus as a type of the Family name, why should we not go a step further and take the type Family name as the name for the Order ?

In presenting courses on systematic zoology to the students a given Order is described in reference to certain well-defined representatives. Hence those so engaged in teaching are actually using " Typical genera " or a typical Family to define an Order. It would be indeed much simpler for the student to understand a definite scheme in which the basis of the naming system hinges upon a well-defined group of animals. To take but one example : if, for instance, it was agreed that in the Order Orthoptera the type Family would be the Family Acrididae, then the name of the Order might be Acridia. At the present time the Order name " Orthoptera " has little bearing on the names applied to all categories beneath the Order, or to a family which would be descriptive of the group as a whole.

F. A. URQUHART,
Director, Royal Ontario Museum of Zoology and Palaeontology, University of Toronto.

DOCUMENT 4/17

By **A. MYRA KEEN** and **SIEMOM W. MULLER**
(*Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 1st July, 1951

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSAL TO INCLUDE ORDERS AND HIGHER TAXONOMIC CATEGORIES IN THE " RÈGLES "

As with Family names, the amount of historical research necessary to establish priority for the various Ordinal and other names of higher categories seems to us to militate against bringing such names within the coverage of the *Règles*. A series of recommendations for future guidance might be useful, but the codification of the names now in use seems to us unnecessary and even undesirable.

DOCUMENT 4/18

Statement of the views of the

COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK

Enclosure to a letter, dated 10th July 1952, from
Dr. JOHN T. ZIMMER, Chairman

(For an extract from the above letter, see Document 1/41)

Z.N.(S.) 360. Nomenclature of orders and higher groups. Rather than elaborate rules for such groups, the alternative proposal of an Official List would be much more satisfactory. Uniform terminations need not be used for any of these grades. There is little uniformity throughout zoology at present and changes would be far-reaching and confusing to non-zoologists.

A.M.N.H. Committee on Nomenclature.

(Signed) EDWIN H. COLBERT.

JOHN T. NICHOLS.

ERNST MAYR.

GEORGE H. H. TATE.

JOHN T. ZIMMER (*Chairman*).

DOCUMENT 4/19

By **HENNING LEMCHE**
(*Universitetets Zoologiska Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*)

(1) Letter dated 17th July, 1952

In an earlier letter* I have tried to show that the ruling on family names are better limited to the questions of how to construct them and the way of deciding their type genera.

When we come to the case of the higher categories, the question is more complex, and at least four different ways of treating the current chaos can be imagined.

(1) To make no rulings at all and let the chaos continue. I would not vote for this way except in the domain of Classes and still higher categories, where, in the interest of the non-zoological public, we cannot alter too much, and where the names in general have been stabilised through many years. In the domain of Orders I prefer other solutions.

(2) To make some strict and definite ruling at once, stating that every name of any Order, Class, etc. is invalid if not formed in a definitely specified way, or deciding that all endings have to be changed at once in a certain way. Such a procedure would be rational, but we have no power to carry it through, and it would certainly fail against the resistance of zoologists.

(3) To rule at once in a way fixing more or less the present chaos. (Your proposal.) This is a possible way, because specialists in every single group would not feel their special interest threatened. However, this solution means that we give up at once and for ever any attempt to bring some conformity into the domain of the names of Orders. If once established, this rule would be extremely difficult to alter in favour of a new attempt to reach conformity. So, I regard your proposal as the last resort if every better proposal fails, but I do not feel that it is a good solution. It will need quite a number of intricate Rules to be arranged for, and there will come out large numbers of controversies to be settled by the Commission.

(4) I think, however, that a better way will be to make *no Rules now*, but to give a few clear *Recommendations*, urging authors to follow some definite

---

* The letter here referred to is reproduced as Document 3/28 in Volume 8.

proposals, but without imposing any force at present. People do not like to be forced, but they often ask for advice. Why not, then, give them the advice that the Commission (Congress) is of the opinion that the best way would be to follow (say) the following Recommendations :

ARTICLE 4.

Recommendation II.—Authors are earnestly asked to construct the names of super-Orders, Orders and sub-Orders in a way exactly parallel to those of families, etc., by adding the ending " **-INEA** " for sub-Orders, "**-IDEA** " for Orders, and ides for super-Orders, to the stem of the name of the type genus in question.

ARTICLE 5.

Recommendation II.—Authors are invited to treat the names on the Ordinal level (if derived in the way prescribed in Recommendation II of Article 4) in a way similar to that prescribed in Article 5 for names on the family level.

N.B.—As explained in a special letter,* I have changed my opinion concerning the use of the ending " **-IDEA** " (" **-OIDEA** "). In my previous letter of 30th June, 1952†, I proposed the ending idea for superfamilies. Now, having returned to Denmark, I have studied the factual names of Orders, etc., in different animal groups and find that the ending " **-IDEA** " is so often used for Orders as to cause confusion if used now for superfamilies. As, moreover, the ruling would gain if some simple system could be applied, I propose now to use the ending " **-IDA** " for superfamilies. This would give the simple row of endings : **"-INI"**, **"-INAE"**, **"-IDAE"**, **"-IDA"**, **"-INEA,"** " **-IDEA** ", " **-IDES** ".

Remarks. As will appear from the above, I have studied the question of whether it is advisable to combine the effort to stabilise nomenclature both in the domain of Orders and in the domain of Classes. It seems that most names of Classes have reached such a stability that very few alterations are likely to occur if the whole problem is left without treatment. Thus, we may expect to meet a very strong resistance against any attempt to attain some conformity. As shown below, this stability has not been reached within the domain of Orders, and we may run the risk that an attempt to rule in this last domain will be greatly hampered if combined with an effort to introduce conformity into the domain of Classes. Therefore, I regard the said danger as so real that I would prefer not to make definite proposals at present concerning the names in the domain of Classes, and to concentrate around the problem of the names of Orders.

---

* See letter of 17th July, 1952, below.

† See Document 3/28.

In my own field, the opisthobranch gastropods, a well defined Sub-Class with new and much better founded subdivisions have been proposed for one half (the nudibranchs) or are being proposed in the near future. In the other half, my own studies show that the divisions now in current use cannot stand at all, so that new Sub-Ordinal names will have to be proposed at the first future revision. Similar situations are certainly found in many other groups of invertebrates. So far as I can see, stabilisation through long use of certain names in the Ordinal level have not occurred except in some few groups: mammals, birds and many insects (and perhaps some echinoderms where my new proposal would conform with general practice or be very close to it). Even so, in quite a number of insect groups the divisions are not too stable (compare the names of Handlirsch and of Weber). In fishes, the ordinal names are rather new and are not too generally known by non-specialists. I cannot see why it should be impossible to ask authors to change the endings in such groups. The stability concept would not even be hampered thereby, as it is the stem of the name that gives the real indication of what is the meaning of the term, and the new ending would just indicate the rank of the group better than if the old ending is retained.

In my view, the gain for zoological science would be enormous if we could lead the development in nomenclature towards the proposed end. It would mean that any ruling concerning Ordinal names would be unnecessary except the adding of some very few words to the Articles 4 and 5. It would mean that no *List of Ordinal Names* would be necessary. It would mean that a lot of controversies to be decided upon by the Commission would simply never come up. No author names and dates behind the names of Orders would be necessary just as in the Family name level—and the very bad question of priority could be totally avoided. Similarly, the wish for making new categories after which to add your own name would be prevented in coming up in the mind of any author interested therein. Last, but not least, it would be an enormous advantage for the zoological science as such if the system was made as easy and clear as it would be under the proposal here submitted.

Therefore, we have everything to gain and nothing to lose if we adopt the procedure to *recommend*, but not to rule definitely, as the first step towards conformity in names on the Ordinal level. In the few groups where the concepts of Orders have been stabilised for such a long time that confusion would arise if the names were to be altered to conform with the general principles now proposed, we could save the names through the procedure prescribed for " Nomina conservanda ".

(2) Letter dated 17th July, 1952

In preparing a responsum on the question of the names of Orders and Classes I found that it would be convenient to use the ending " -IDEA " not for superfamilies, but for Orders. In a survey that I had no opportunity to make on board the *Galathea*, but which I have made now, on the actual names of higher categories in the animal kingdom, I found that the ending " -IDEA " has been used so often, and is nearly always centering round the concept of Orders, that it would mean unnecessary confusion to transfer it to superfamilies. As the ending " -OIDEA " might in several cases be too close to " -IDEA ", I should not like to go in for this ending either. In another letter to you sent together with this one, I propose to use the ending " -IDEA " for Orders, and hence I wish to alter my proposal concerning superfamily-names, and to make an amendment to your proposal. It is quite clear that the concept of superfamilies is a less important one, the ending of which could be made quite arbitrarily without serious damage and I would like now to propose the ending " -IDA ".

DOCUMENT 4/20

By **E. RAYMOND HALL**
(*University of Kansas, Department of Zoology, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 22nd July, 1952

Probably no rules should be adopted in 1953.

DOCUMENT 4/21

Statement setting out the views of members of the

NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY

(Letter, dated 22nd July, 1952, with enclosures, from
Dr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman)

ORDERS AND HIGHER CATEGORIES ; Z.N.(S.) 360

The Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology has not agreed upon a treatment of this subject that is satisfactory to a majority of its members.

I am therefore enclosing copies of the comments received from each member of the Committee who has expressed his views. You will note that the comments of one member are submitted on a copy of Dr. J. C. Bradley's dissertation, and are distinguished thereon by bold type.

Further discussion of this subject by a member of this committee (and by other members of the society) is submitted by way of the minutes of a symposium recently conducted by the Pacific Section of the society. Only that portion of these minutes which deals with Orders and higher categories is enclosed. This material does not constitute a part of the committee's report but is submitted by way of a supplement thereto.

APPENDICES 1 AND 2 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

Appendix 1 (views of Dr. J. Chester Bradley) and Appendix 2 (views of Professor Robert L. Usinger)

Note : Professor Usinger's views are in the form of comments interpolated at various points in the papers by Dr. Bradley. In the typescript furnished by Dr. Follett, Professor Usinger's comments were distinguished from Dr. Bradley's text by being underlined. They are here so distinguished by being printed in bold type.

Enclosure 1 to Appendices 1 and 2

SUMMARY OF THE PROBLEM INVOLVED IN THE NAMING OF ORDERS AND HIGHER CATEGORIES

THE NAMING OF ORDERS AND HIGHER CATEGORIES : BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROBLEMS*

By **J. C. BRADLEY**

(The Paragraphs are numbered to correspond to numbers used in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7 : 95–108)

5. Shall Order (Class, Phylum) be defined by the type concept ? **Yes.**

---

* Before reaching any decision, the full statement of the Secretary of the Commission (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 97-118) should be studied. [J.C.B.]

If so, should the type unit be

(*a*) a type-family (except in the case of Orders not provided with Families, in which case it would be a type-genus, to become automatically type-genus of type-family when Families are established) ?

(*b*) a type-genus, with provision that the latter be also type-genus of each successive nominotypical sub-unit ? **Yes.**

6. Uniform termination for orders in all phyla would cause wide-spread changing of established names. Should they be provided for some groups, where desired, ex. gr. Aves where " -iformes " is used by general consent ? **No uniform terminations except when authorised in special cases (Aves) by Commission.** If so, where an order is transferred from the Class, should it retain its termination or be deprived of it ? **Retain.**

7. As in the case of the names of Families, Sub-Families and Tribes, names of Orders, sub-Orders and minor divisions (this probably means above Super-Family) should be co-ordinate. Should names of Orders be co-ordinate with those of Classes (in view of the tendency to advance Orders to rank of Class), and therefore to avoid much name-changing ? **Yes.**

8. Prior to 1850 it would be very difficult to apply any definition of publication to an Ordinal Name. Shall we apply one definition to this early period, a second to more recent work, and a third to publication after the adoption of legislation ? **Not too difficult, one definition prior to new rule, one after.**

9. It would be impractical to apply priority to all Ordinal Names. Shall we apply three standards, paralleling the suggestions in paragraph 8 ? **No ; standards as elsewhere in rules : priority or appeal to Commission in difficult cases.**

10. Shall the scheme for emendation of Families be applied also to Ordinal Names ? (No advantage would ensue from a different set of principles.) **Yes.**

11. Although nominotypical sub-units of Families, genera and species bear tautonymous names, this has not been customary for Orders, Classes or Phyla and to require it would be strongly objectionable. **Yes.**

12. Should the citation of the names of authors be recognised in the *Règles* as correct ? **Yes.**

13. A stop must be put to homonymy between Ordinal Names (as Decapoda in Crustacea and in Mollusca). It is suggested that such cases, if now existing, be referred to the Commission, but that priority should apply to cases of homonymy arising after the enaction of a regulation. **Priority unless appealed to Commission.**

14. It is suggested that the provisions proposed to apply in case of families should govern cases of names of Orders and similar categories that are very similar but not identical. **Yes.**

15. It has been recently suggested that names already published for Orders or higher categories should not be available for genera, at least in the Order concerned. **A Recommendation only !** Any provision must prevent a new generic name from invalidating an established Ordinal name or *vice versa.* **Of course ; they are not co-ordinate.**

16. Names of Classes and of Phyla should be treated under the same principles as those of Orders, and defined respectively in terms of types. It seems desirable to make names of Classes and Phyla co-ordinate. **Yes.**

17. In many instances Ordinal Class and sub-Class names are based on the same word, with slightly different termination. It is suggested that the advantages of a change in this respect would be outweighed by the disadvantages. The principle is well-established in case of families, subfamilies and tribes. **Yes.**

18. An Official List of the Names of Orders and Higher Categories and an Index of Rejected Names will be necessary. Each name should appear as published, irrespective as to whether it is currently applied to a higher or lower co-ordinate category. Second names (with different types) should be added to the list as available for those who consider that the types belong to different Orders, etc. **Yes.**

19. It will be difficult to date names currently assigned to Ordinal (or co-ordinate) names that were published prior to about 1850. It will also be difficult to establish a method for determining types of groups already established.

(*a*) Under alternative solution 1, definite rules would cover all problems. The law of priority would be applied to Ordinal (and co-ordinate) names, and the type would be the originally included unit originally designated or first selected. The Commission would be empowered, on application, to vary the law in particular cases to conserve usage.

(*b*) Under alternative 2, the scheme would differ only in application of Law of Priority and method of determining types. These would not be subject to set rules. In their stead the Commission would be authorised, on application, to determine the names to be applied to Orders, Classes and Phyla by authors who recognise the group involved as taxonomically required. The Commission would at the same time determine the types. The Secretary feels that the second alternative would avoid risk of undesirable disturbance of names.

19 (a). By all means

Enclosure 2 to Appendices 1 and 2

COMMENTARY ON THE PROPOSALS RELATING TO THE NAMING OF ORDERS AND HIGHER CATEGORIES SUMMARISED IN ENCLOSURE 1

Note : As in the case of Enclosure 1, the main text of the following document is by Dr. J. Chester Bradley, the views of Professor Robert L. Usinger being in the form of interpolated notes ; these latter are distinguished by being printed in bold type.

COMMENTARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

By **J. C. BRADLEY**

(a) It is perhaps unintentional that no account is taken of Super-Order, Sub-Class, Super-Class and Sub-Phylum. These are essential to flexibility and should be legalised for use wherever authors wish to employ them. **O K.**

(b) So far as names prior to about 1850, and probably (at least as far as possible) so far as all up to the present are concerned, plan 19b is strongly preferable. I recommend going further. I think it would be practicable, more efficient, and in the long run save much difficulty if the Commission were to undertake, prior to 1958, to select the name to be accepted, and the type to be assigned it, for each Order, Class and Phylum as well as intermediate category of animals. This should be accomplished by inviting a committee of specialists in each major group to prepare and submit for adoption a recommended list of names within their field. It should be understood that first consideration should be given to current usage, second to length of usage, and when these afforded no clear basis for choice, to other considerations (such as priority) that should be specified. The names must not be illustrative of any particular taxonomic scheme, but must provide, so far as practicable, an available name for every taxonomic group of Ordinal or co-ordinate rank that has been proposed, even though many, or the majority, or even all authors consider many such names to be subjective synonyms of others. By careful selection of types, any of two or more names for the same Order or other category can be disposed of by being made objective synonyms, or made subjectively available, even though supposedly a synonym, for those who consider their types to belong to different groups of the same rank. In selecting types attention should be paid primarily to selecting those that are taxonomically most central and hence least liable ever to be removed on taxonomic grounds from the groups to which the names they typify are normally understood to apply. It would seem desirable to provide that disqualifying a name for use at one level need not necessarily disqualify it at another. The usefulness of this can be illustrated by an example : The names Plectoptera and Ephemerida are each in use for Mayflies. There are three Sub-Orders of fossil Mayflies and one Sub-Order of recent Mayflies. In my own teaching I employ Plectoptera for the Order, Ephemerida for the Sub-Order containing recent Mayflies.

The list recommended by the committees of specialists would have to be published for consideration by and advice from the zoological public before adoption by the Commission.

In view of the relatively small number of names involved, the co-operative effort proposed does not appear unrealisable. The list should be brought down to the current time and Sub-Orders also included in every major group where it can be done within the bounds of the time and labour that can reasonably be devoted. But a great step will have been taken if, in some groups, it is even brought no further than to 1850. The labour will be greatly lightened in view of the fact that a bibliographical history of each name is not essential, since usage rather than priority is to be paramount. If the list in some groups cannot be brought to completeness, to the extent of including all objective or even all subjective synonyms, at least the major objective will be attained if a valid name can be established for all groups which it is foreseen are likely to be required. The other details could be filled in later, from time to time, with no appreciable loss of effectiveness.

Rules involving priority can be and should be laid down to cover the future, as the Secretary has proposed.

I prefer 19a

[Words in bold comprise the comments of Dr. Robert L. Usinger.]

COMMENTS ON THE NUMBERED PROPOSALS

5. Definition should be by type. Principle (*b*) is clearer, involves no exceptions, sacrifices no advantage. It is more logical because it begins with one unit as base and carries it right through to the top. It would be more complex to define Order in terms of Family, Family in terms of genus, Class in terms of Order, Phylum in terms of Class, although the actual result is the same.

6. Uniform terminations in all Phyla are not practicable. There is no objection to providing them for certain groups where overwhelming sentiment demands them. A name transferred into such a group, or from one such to another, should assume the required termination.

7. From Sub-Order to Phyla names should be co-ordinate, but the suppression of a name at one level should not necessarily forbid its use at another.

8-9. Unnecessary if the plan suggested in paragraph (*b*) above is followed.

10. It seems desirable that the same principles in regard to emendation should govern both Family names and those of Orders and co-ordinate groups.

11. Agreed.

12. Yes, but optional. The citation should refer to the original author of the name and *not* to the scope to which some author, original or later, has applied it. The latter usage is very common.

13. Agreed.

14. It seems desirable that the same principles should be applied here to both Family and Ordinal names and their co-ordinates.

15. Suggestion good, qualification agreed to.

16, 17 and **18.** Agreed.

19. Second alternative preferred, if the scheme provided by paragraph (*b*) of these comments cannot be adopted.

APPENDIX 3 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

Comments furnished by **CURTIS W. SABROSKY**

REACTIONS ON NAMING OF ORDERS, ETC.

My initial reaction to this subject, both before and after reading Secretary Hemming's report, is general opposition to the whole proposal for inclusion of the subject of names of Orders and co-ordinate and higher categories under the International Code. I would much prefer, and was planning to recommend, that the approach should be through committees of specialists, who should attempt to reach agreement on names that had proved themselves by virtue of usage, usefulness and euphony.

Then I read Dr. Bradley's plan as outlined in his paragraph " b ", and this is so completely in accord with my views that I vote for it enthusiastically as a substitute for the Secretary's proposal (at least for names up to 1958). The plan has several advantages :

(1) It would be a suitable project for the Linnaean Celebration in 1958.

(2) As an important reference work, it would do much to contribute to uniformity, just as the list by A. S. Pearse has undoubtedly done much in that direction.

(3) If " types " are to be established, for Ordinal and higher categories, in many cases only a formality, now is a good time to do it on a comprehensive basis, for relatively few " types " have been established for those categories.

(4) It is necessary, if the suggestion in paragraph 15 (Hemming) is to be at all practicable. Nomenclators do not contain those names, and some comprehensive list is needed.

I may add that the same approach proposed by Dr. Bradley could also be applied to Family names, though the project would be considerably larger. This is the very sort of thing which I had in mind in proposing the preparation of an " Official List of Family Names in Zoology " (Sabrosky, 1947, *Amer. Nat.*, **81** : 159).

COMMENTS ON NUMBERED PROPOSALS

Several of these would not apply if Dr. Bradley's plan were adopted. Otherwise, I agree with Dr. Bradley's comments, except as follows :—

12. No, except for cases where the person discussing them needs to distinguish between them, as in discussing the suprageneric nomenclature of a group. Authorship of genera and all names below them has put enough personal element into the problem. I see nothing to be gained by citing authorship for Pisces, Coleoptera, etc. Even for Decapoda, the need to be specific is more satisfactorily filled by citing " Decapoda (Mollusca) " and " Decapoda (Crustacea) " than by giving the authorship.

13. Agree, but Dr. Bradley's plan would of course cover it for the past.

15. This suggestion seems to me to be impracticable. In order to work, all names of Ordinal and co-ordinate and higher categories would have to be completely catalogued in nomenclators, which they are not. Such a list, though perhaps lacking all the synonyms, could be developed separate from the generic nomenclators if Dr. Bradley's plan were adopted.

APPENDIX 4 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

Comment furnished by **CHARLES D. MICHENER**

I agree with Bradley, as commented upon by Sabrosky.

APPENDIX 5 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

Comment furnished by **W. I. FOLLETT**

I doubt that " standardisation " of the highly subjective concept of Orders and higher categories should be regulated by the International Commission, or attempted by " official " specialist groups.

APPENDIX 6 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

Comment furnished by **HENRY TOWNES**

Any rules for these (*i.e.*, Ordinal, etc. Names) would probably do more harm than good.

APPENDIX 7 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

Comments furnished by **JOHN W. WELLS**

NAMING OF ORDERS AND HIGHER CATEGORIES

I cannot agree with any proposals to introduce rules for regulating the names of Orders and higher categories, unless they be conditional upon simultaneous establishment of uniform terminations for all categories from Phylum down. This last may be a desirable reform, but, I fear, a lost cause on the basis of the preliminary skirmish in this direction with the *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology.* It would be ridiculous to legislate—and the Commission is in no position to jeopardise further its reputation for common sense—on co-ordinate names, priority, dates, emendations, homonymy, tautonymy, citation, etc., unless a perfectly uniform system be set up.

APPENDIX 8 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

Comments furnished by **JOHN T. ZIMMER**

Z.N.(S.)360. ORDERS AND HIGHER GROUPS

No need for elaborate rules. I prefer an *Official List* of such names which need not have uniform terminations. The changes necessitated would go far beyond zoologists and be confusing.

APPENDIX 9 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

EXTRACT FROM THE PROCEEDINGS OF A SYMPOSIUM ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE RELATING TO THE NAMING OF ORDERS AND OTHER HIGHER CATEGORIES HELD BY THE PACIFIC SECTION OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY AT THE OREGON STATE COLLEGE, CORNWALLIS, OREGON, U.S.A., ON FRIDAY, 20TH JUNE, 1952.

SYMPOSIUM: *Problems of Nomenclatorial Practice Now Under Consideration by the International Commission.* W. I. FOLLETT, presiding.

5. The Possible Addition to the *Règles* of Provisions Governing the Naming of Orders and Higher Taxonomic Categories.

The time that remained was spent in discussing, under the leadership of Dr. Usinger, an aspect of this question on which the advice of specialists is now being sought: Should Orders, Classes, and Phyla be defined by types, and if so, should the type be a genus, or a family, or some other category ?

Dr. Usinger read sections from a plan proposed by Dr. J. Chester Bradley, under which the International Commission would be authorised to prepare master lists of these higher categories and to fix types, presumably at the generic level. Dr. Brittan inquired on what basis the type genus would be selected, whether priority, euphony of name, locality, or some other. Mr. Follett queried the criteria practicable in such matters.

Dr. de Laubenfels favoured retention of the *status quo* unless it could be shown that definite advantages would result from any new arrangement. Dr. Usinger thought that the stability which would result constituted a sufficient advantage, and cited the variety of Ordinal Names in current use for the insects, no two authors seeming to agree upon the same list.

Dr. Ferris would restrict the proposal to categories of superfamily and below. He also raised the question as to what would constitute priority in the case of an Ordinal or class name. Dr. Usinger admitted the possibility of priority without types, with usage alone as a guide. Dr. Belkin, however, was of the opinion that priority could not be used without the type system.

With such a variety of opinion expressed, and in consideration of the limited information available, it was decided not to take a vote on the proposal. It appeared, however, to be consensus of those present (1) that Orders should not be defined by the type concept ; (2) that no strong opposition to the application of priority was indicated ; and (3) that otherwise the recommendations embodied in Dr. J. C. Bradley's commentary upon Mr. Hemming's views are generally acceptable.

JOHN S. GARTH,
Provisional Secretary

DOCUMENT 4/22

Statement of the views of the

AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON ENTOMOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Enclosure to a letter, dated 24th July, 1952, from

Professor CHARLES D. MICHENER, Chairman

ORDERS (COMMISSION REFERENCE Z.N.(S.) 360)

It is perhaps unintentional that in Mr. Hemming's proposals (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7, pp. 95–108, 1952) no account is taken of Super-Order, Sub-Class, Super-Class and Sub-Phylum. These are essential to flexibility and should be legalised for use wherever authors wish to employ them.

So far as names published up to the present time are concerned, alternative 2 (in Hemming's paragraph 19) is strongly preferable. We recommend going farther. It would be practicable, more efficient, and in the long run save much difficulty if the Commission were to undertake, prior to the Linnaean celebration in 1958, to select the name to be accepted, and the type to be assigned it, for each Order, Class and Phylum as well as intermediate category of animals. This should be accomplished by inviting a committee of specialists in each major group to prepare and submit for adoption a recommended list of names within their field. It should be understood that first consideration should be given to current usage, second to length of usage, and when these afforded no clear basis for choice, to other considerations (such as priority) that should be specified. The names must not be illustrative of any particular taxonomic scheme, but must provide, so far as practicable, an available name for every taxonomic group of ordinal or co-ordinate rank that has been proposed, even though many, or the majority, or even all authors consider many such names to be subjective synonyms of others. By careful selection of types, any of two or more names for the same order or other category can be disposed of by being made objective synonyms, or made subjectively available, even though supposedly a synonym, for those who consider their types to belong to different groups of the same rank. In selecting types attention should be paid primarily to selecting those that are taxonomically most central and hence least liable ever to be removed on taxonomic grounds from the groups to which the names they typify are normally understood to apply. It would seem desirable to provide that disqualifying a name for use at one level need not necessarily disqualify it at another. The usefulness of this can be illustrated by an example : The names Plectoptera and Ephemerida are each in use for Mayflies. There are three Sub-Orders of fossil Mayflies and one Sub-Order of recent Mayflies. It is possible to employ Plectoptera for the Order, Ephemerida for the Sub-Order containing recent Mayflies.

The list recommended by the committees of specialists would have to be published for consideration by and advice from the zoological public before adoption by the Commission.

In view of the relatively small number of names involved, the co-operative effort proposed does not appear unrealisable. The list should be brought down to the current time and Sub-Orders also included in every major group where it can be done within the bounds of the time and labour that can reasonably be devoted. But a great step will have been taken if, in some groups, it is even brought no further than to 1850. The labour will be greatly lightened in view of the fact that a bibliographical history of each name is not essential, since usage rather than priority is to be paramount. If the list in some groups cannot be brought to completeness, to the extent of including all objective or even all subjective synonyms, at least the major objective will be attained if a valid name can be established for all groups which it is foreseen are likely to be required. The other details could be filled in later, from time to time, with no appreciable loss of effectiveness.

Rules involving priority can be and should be laid down to cover the future as the Secretary has proposed.

Another importance of the list, which would be a valuable reference work, is that Hemming's paragraph **15** would be impractical without it.

The following comments utilise the paragraph numbers found in Mr. Hemming's treatment.

5. Definition should be by type. Principle *b* is clearer, involves no exceptions, sacrifices no advantage. It is more logical because it begins with one unit as base and carries it right through to the top. It would be more complex to define Order in terms of Family, Family in terms of Genus, Class in terms of Order, Phylum in terms of Class, although the actual result is the same.

6. Uniform terminations in all Phyla are not practicable. There is no objection to providing them for certain groups where overwhelming sentiment demands them. A name transferred into such a group, or from one such to another, should assume the required termination.

7. From Sub-Order to Phyla names should be co-ordinate, but the suppression of a name at one level should not necessarily forbid its use at another.

8-9. Unnecessary if the plan suggested in paragraph (*b*) above is followed.

10. It seems desirable that the same principles in regard to emendation should govern both family names and those of orders and co-ordinate groups.

11. Agreed.

12. Yes, but optional. The citation should refer to the original author of the name and *not* to the scope to which some author, original or later, has applied it. The latter usage is very common.

13. Agreed.

14. It seems desirable that the same principles should be applied here to both Family and Ordinal names and their co-ordinates.

15. Suggestion good, qualification agreed to.

16, 17 and **18.** Agreed.

19. Second alternative preferred, if the scheme provided by paragraph (*b*) of these comments cannot be adopted.

American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature
CHARLES D. MICHENER, *Secretary*

DOCUMENT 4/23

Statement setting out the views of members of the

COMMITTEE ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ICHTHYOLOGISTS AND HERPETOLOGISTS

Letter, dated 26th July, 1952, with enclosures,.from

Dr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman

ORDERS ; Z.N.(S.) 360

The Committee on Zoological Nomenclature, of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, at present includes the following members :

Dr. Charles M. Bogert, The American Museum of Natural History, New York City, New York.
Dr. Fred R. Cagle, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana.
Dr. Hobart M. Smith, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.
Dr. Robert C. Stebbins, University of California, Berkeley, California.
Mr. W. I. Follett (Chairman), California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California.

This Committee has considered the problems requiring consideration if provisions relating to the naming of Orders and Higher Taxonomic Categories are to be included in the *Règles*. The views of several members of this committee are expressed in the correspondence of which copies are attached to this letter. As a member of another society,* I have already sent you my views upon this subject, and therefore I shall not duplicate them here.

In order to provide you with as many viewpoints as possible, and in accordance with suggestions received from the committee members, I am enclosing copies of correspondence on this subject that I have received from other members of the society.

EXPLANATORY NOTE BY FRANCIS HEMMING, SECRETARY TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

In 1951 I had some correspondence on the question of the principles which it was desirable should be followed in the naming of Orders and Higher Taxonomic Categories with Dr. W. I. Follett, Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists. On 9th August of that year, I addressed to Dr. Follett a letter on this subject which he circulated to the members of the foregoing Nomenclature Committee.

---

* See the letter dated 22nd July, 1952, written by Dr. Follett, as Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology reproduced in the present part as Document 4/21 (p. 33).

Of the eight signed statements enclosed with Dr. Follett's letter of 26th July, 1952, five were written on various dates in the autumn of 1951, *i.e.*, at a time when the only statement from the Office of the Commisssion that was available was my latter of 9th August, 1951, and long before the publication in March 1952 of the comprehensive survey of the problems involved in my paper " Problems requiring consideration if provisions relating to the naming of Orders and Higher Categories are to be included in the *Règles* : An Appeal for Advice " (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7 : 95–108). The communications bearing dates in 1951 furnished by Dr. Follett are those received from : Charles M. Bogert ; William A. Gosline ; Robert R. Miller ; Hobart M. Smith (first communication only) ; Norman J. Willimovsky.

Since the comments in the foregoing communications are directed not to my paper of March 1952 but to my earlier preliminary letter of 9th August 1951 and, in some cases, are not intelligible without reference to the former, I give below what I hope will be a sufficient summary of the questions raised in that letter :—

Question (1) : If it is agreed that the concept denoted by an Ordinal, etc., name shall be determined by a " type ", is it desirable that that " type " should be (1) an included family, in cases where families have been established, or (2) in every case, a type genus or (3) some other unit and, if so, what ?

Question (2) : Should the names of Orders and Sub-Orders be co-ordinate with one another (as are the names of genera and sub-genera) ?

Question (3) : What tests should be adopted for determining, as regards the back literature, whether an Ordinal or Sub-Ordinal name has been established ? Is a name published for a group above the family level to be accepted, when not expressly termed an Ordinal or Sub-Ordinal name at the time of publication ? Are such names to acquire priority as from the date of publication and irrespective of the termination employed ?

Question (4) : As regards names given in future, what tests should be adopted for determining whether, in a given case, an Ordinal or Sub-Ordinal name has been validly established ? If the tests to be adopted under (3) above are—in the interests of stability—to be of a lenient character, is it desirable that more rigorous rules should be applied as regards the future ? For example, should the designation of a " type " for the Order or Sub-Order concerned be made an essential condition for the acceptance of such a name ?

Question (5) : If it is considered that it would be desirable to prescribe specified terminations for the names of Orders in parts of the animal kingdom where this could be done without detriment to stability, what steps should be taken to define the group to names in which a given specified termination is to be applied ? Should this be by reference, for example, to the boundaries given to (say) a specified Class in some generally accepted monograph or textbook ? Should there be provision for the case where a large Class (*e.g.*, Pisces) is later divided into two or more Classes (*a*) that for the restricted Class divided off from the original Class the Ordinal names shall retain the terminations hitherto prescribed for them or should there be a provision under which a new termination could be introduced for the names of Orders included in the restricted Class ?

Question (6) : Should the Code provide means for citing the authorship to be attributed to Ordinal names and the date to be applied to such names for the purposes of priority ?

Question (7) *:* Should Ordinal names be subject to a Law of Priority similar to that which applies to other kinds of names ?

Question (8) : Is it practicable to devise rules for determining, as regards existing names, how homonymy in Ordinal names is to be avoided and put an end to ? If this is not considered to be practicable, should the Code provide simply for the reference of cases of homonymy of this kind to the International Commission for decision ?

Question (9) *:* In the case of names published for Orders after the introduction of the new scheme, should homonymy be prevented through the Law of Priority, as in the case of generic names ?

Question (10) *:* Is it considered that, where, prior to introduction of the scheme, an Ordinal name has been established, the word of which that Ordinal name consists may not validly be used as a generic name and that any generic name consisting of that word is to be rejected ? Is it considered that, where, after the introduction of the scheme, an Ordinal name is published consisting of a word that has already been published as a generic name, that Ordinal name should on that account be rejected ?

Alternative lines of approach : The letter of 9th August, 1951 concluded with the following final question : If the names of Orders and other supra-family groups are to be regulated in the Code, would it be better (*a*) that an attempt should be made to deal explicitly with every situation which might arise, or (*b*), at least as regards names published before the introduction of the scheme, to confine the provisions to a statement of the general principles to be followed in determining the availability of any given Ordinal etc. name, with the addition of a provision that, in any case of disagreement, the name in question is to be referred to the International Commission for decision ? Attention was drawn to the fact that the adoption of the second of these courses would lead naturally to the establishment of an " Official List of the Names of Orders and Higher Systematic Categories in Zoology " and would thus be in harmony with the practice adopted already in the case of the names of lower systematic categories.

APPENDIX 1 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

THE NOMENCLATURE OF THE HIGHER ANIMAL CATEGORIES

> *Note by Dr. Follett :* This paper was submitted 30th June, 1952, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Zoological Nomenclature, of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists. At the author's request, it is presented anonymously.

By way of reply to your letter of 20th June, I will comment as intelligently as I can on the nomenclature of the higher animal categories.

It seems to me that my ideas have got to be divided into two sections. The first regards the possibility of introducing a uniform system of nomenclature throughout the animal kingdom. Here, I cannot omit emphasising that my ideas merely represent the judgment of one man whose experience is with but one group of animals. You can use these comments in any way you see fit, but I would prefer to have them used, if at all, without reference to authorship and as a means of extracting opinions from others. The second section regards the problem of the nomenclature of the higher categories of fishes. You did not ask me for comments on this subject, but I send them on because I would like to get your ideas on this matter. I sort of suspect that my ideas on this subject are somewhat premature, and that there would be little point in broadcasting them at the present time.

SECTION I.—*Regarding a Uniform System of Nomenclature for Higher Categories throughout the Animal Kingdom*

There is in the animal kingdom a whole host of Ordinal and other names which are widely and well known and about which there is no confusion. These names, arrived at by a consensus of opinion, fulfil the function of zoological nomenclature far better than a large proportion of the names under the jurisdiction of the International Commission. Even Hemming agrees that such names should not be changed, Then, if we are to apply a uniform system of nomenclature to the higher categories and place this system under the jurisdiction of the International Commission, how far are we to carry it ? Should we exempt, for example, all of the higher insect categories from such a system, or only some of them ? Or again should we exempt some of the names within a category of a given group, say insect orders, and apply rules to others ? In short, where and how do we make exceptions ? Hemming would probably say to send doubtful names to the International Commission for consideration, but this would eventually lead to a consideration of most or all of the names of the higher categories. Now, when these names have all been considered and acted upon, I doubt that the situation will have been improved, but in the meantime what do we do ?

But say that we can work this out and end up with about half of a uniform system, the uniform half being regulated by the International Commission, what about this regulated half ? What system are we to use for it ? Stenzel's ? I completely agree with Simpson's remarks (1952 : 22) concerning the difficulties of applying this system and have more to say on the subject below. But if not Stenzel's, then what ? Say we work out a system which will not too badly disrupt the names in one animal group, will it be suitable to another ? I doubt it.

But let us say that we have worked out a system that is suitable all round, then what ? Do we apply a type system with a law of priority similar to that in genera, as Hemming suggests ? Simpson (1952 : 21) has pointed out the disadvantages of these features, too, and again I completely agree with him. I wonld far rather apply the principle of usage, but how does the International Commission rule on usage ? Again, only by establishing a list of *nomina conservanda* which will eventually include most or all of the names in the higher categories.

I quite agree with Hemming that the present anarchy in the nomenclature of the higher categories of some groups (notably fishes) is distressing and reflects widely and adversely on those of us in these fields and on zoologists in general. I do not think, however, that regulations from the International Commission would improve the situation. Rather, I think it is a matter that should be worked out within each group separately by a consensus of opinion of the zoologists working in the group.

As I have said before I think there is much in favour of having different animal groups named in different ways. In the first place I think we could all profit from the experience of workers in different groups in which various systems of nomenclature are used. From this experience we can decide whether any uniform system is advantageous, and if so what system. If the attainment of such experience means delay, why, we have already delayed several decades on the matter, so why rush into it now when we still have little experience with it ? Would it not be better for the specialists in each group to feel their way along in the matter until they reach the best solution for their own group ? And if no uniformity of system is reached for the various groups, is any harm done ? The objective of nomenclature, as I see it, is to be able to let the other fellow know as clearly and as succinctly and as easily as possible what you are talking about. Perhaps, if the entomologists continue to end most of their Orders in *-ptera*, the ornithologists theirs in *-iformes*, and mammalogists theirs with nothing in particular, more is accomplished along this line than would be by applying a uniform system of endings. At least now any zoologist should be able to spot Diptera as an insect group, and no entomologist is confused as to what is meant.

In summary, I believe that the problem of names for the higher categories in many groups exists and should not be shirked, but that is one the specialists in these groups should solve and that regulation by the International Commission would only add to the confusion.

SECTION II.—*Suggestions Concerning the Nomenclature of the Higher Fish Categories*

The following notes have been prepared after teaching a half-year course in fish classification for the fourth time. Whereas the research systematist can often avoid presenting a comprehensible set of names for the higher fish categories, the teacher cannot. These notes, then, have at least the merit of some experience with the subject.

At the present time there are at least three different nomenclatorial practices in use for the higher fish categories. This means at least three names for each Order, Sub-Order, and Superfamily, exactly those levels which must be stressed in any course or general work on fish classification.

According to earlier practice each Order was given a separate name derived from the Greek or Latin. The most recent system, that of Stenzel (*Science*, 1950 : 94) has been approved by members of the A.S.I.H. (*Copeia*, 1950 : 326). According to Stenzel's system the following endings would be uniformly used for each of the higher categories : Subtribe, *-ini* ; Tribe, *-idi* ; Supertribe, *-ici* ; Subfamily, *-inae* ; Family, *-idae* ; Superfamily, *-icae* ; Sub-Order, *-ina* ; Order, *-ida* ; and Super-Order, *-ica*. Berg's system (1940 : 353) is somewhat similar but uses the stem of an included genus as a base throughout these categories, adding the following endings : *ini*[1] for Subfamily ; *-idae* for Family ; *-oidae* for Superfamily ; *-oidei* for Sub-Order, and *-formes* for Order.

During the years that I have been teaching systematic ichthyology, I have tried all three nomenclatorial practices. The results of my attempt to present Greek and Latin ordinal names to students were unsatisfactory. These names meant nothing to the students and had to be learned by rote, thus imposing an added nomenclatorial burden on an already imposing zoological one.

As a result of this experience, Berg's system was tried. Though this system was more satisfactory it had the disadvantages that it was not used in most of the literature and that Berg's ordinal termination was often used by Regan for " Division ". For the more poorly known Orders, e.g., Gobiesociformes (for Xenopterygii), Pegasiformes (for Hypostomides), etc., Berg's names proved to be much easier to learn than the earlier Classic ones, but for the better known orders it was necessary to present both Berg's name and the earlier one, e.g., Clupeiformes and Isospondyli, Cypriniformes and Ostariophysi, etc. In using Berg's system it was probably in the Perciformes *vs.* Percomorphi that the greatest difficulty arose because it is here that Regan makes the most extensive use of the ending *-formes* for his " Divisions " (equal superfamilies).

In 1951 Stenzel's system of nomenclature was used in class. This system had the advantage of shorter names, but an extremely serious difficulty shortly became apparent. If, under Stenzel's system, one speaks of " berycid fishes ", the hearer has no way of knowing whether a Family or an Order (or a Tribe) is under consideration[2]. The same sort of confusion arises in speaking of the berycine, or trying to speak of the berycic, fishes. A relatively minor defect of Stenzel's system is that his names have been as yet almost unused in fishes.

---

[1] Berg (*in litt.*) agreed to change this ending to *-inae* in the revised edition of his " Classification," which he was preparing at the time of his death.

From the above experience with the three types of nomenclature, I should like to offer the following tentative suggestions as a basis of discussion. However, before doing so it seems well to reiterate certain of the principles upon which these suggestions are based. It seems to me that a classification should be expressed in as easily assimilable a manner as possible. If two names denote a group equally well and other things are equal, the one which is more easily learned should be used. Of course, other things are rarely equal. The more difficult name may be much more deeply embedded in the literature, and often is in fishes. Thus, the feature of assimilability must be balanced against usage. In fishes, however, usage has rarely been consistent, so that this aspect plays a much lesser rôle than in certain other groups, for example, insect Orders. In fact the present, with its three types of nomenclature all in use, would seem to be an excellent time to emphasise the feature of assimilability and to do what changing needs to be done to improve the nomenclature of the higher fish categories.

There are not now, and I hope never will be, rules which say how the names of the higher fish categories should be formed. If this holds we can follow whatever system or lack of system suits us best. And if we decide on a system, I see no crucial objection to making exceptions, providing we can reach a consensus of opinion as to what exceptions to make. The important point to me is to set up the best names we can for the higher categories of fishes, to reach some agreement as to what names these are, and to use these as consistently as possible.

With these matters in mind the following suggestions are made :

For Orders of rare or little-known fishes I would advocate that either the ending *-formes* or *-morphi* be added to the stem of an included genus. (One can speak equally well of beryciform or berycomorph fishes, and both endings have been used for fish Orders.) I would advocate that the stem (for Orders and all other categories dealt with below) be based on a well-known genus and that usage and consensus of opinion, nor priority, determine what the stem should be.

For Sub-Orders either of the terminations *-oidea* or *-oidei* would appear acceptable, providing the termination *-oidae* or *-oidea* is not used for superfamily.

---

[2] This difficulty does not arise to nearly the same extent under Berg's system, where one can speak of the beryciform or berycid, but unfortunately not berycoid, fishes with relative clarity as to what systematic level is meant.

Simpson (1952 : 22), however, emphasises the confusion that results from having as many as six taxonomic levels all with the same stem. I believe that this is an advantage rather than a disadvantage, and that more confusion would arise from having to learn several different stems than from having to learn to distinguish once and for all six different endings on the same stem. Fortunately, the instances when such a situation would arise are no more numerous than the number of orders, and even in the great majority of fish orders all of these taxonomic levels are not used.

For superfamilies I have no preference for terminations. The ending *-icae* of Stenzel is perhaps worth considering. For other systematic levels, terminations are either not needed at the moment or have already been designated by the International Commission.

There remains then the problem of certain well-known Ordinal names. Consistency in applying any system of nomenclature holds certain, though not to my mind overwhelming, advantages. Among recent fishes I would be very willing to make exceptions for the following Ordinal names :

Euselachii for the modern sharks
Crossopterygii
Dipnoi
Isospondyli
Iniomi
Ostariophysi
Anacanthini
Heterosomata
Plectognathi[3]

I do not believe this list should be greatly amplified, and if it were diminished or eliminated I should have no objection.

As to the names of fossil fish groups, whether any or all of them are made to conform with the system advocated here I would prefer to leave very largely to the paleontologists.

Below the Ordinal level, I see no reason for making exceptions. Above the Ordinal level, I see no point in systematising fish nomenclature.

In closing, I should like to call attention to two individual cases. One is the use of Agnatha for a superclass by the A.S.I.H. (*Copeia*, 1950 : 326). If Agnatha is to be used for a superclass then what name is to be used for the class ? To speak of the fourth fish class as the " monorhines ", as apparently advocated by the A.S.I.H., doesn't seem very satisfactory. However, I have no suggestions to offer in this regard that *are* very satisfactory. I shall perforce use agnathans both as a class and a superclass. Perhaps some modification of the name Agnatha could be made for its use in the one category or the other.

The second name that worries me is that of the Order to which the modern sharks (as opposed to the skates and rays) belong. The name Selachii has been kicked around so much as to have become ambiguous. My best idea here is Euselachii.

APPENDIX 2 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

Statement, dated 11th October, 1951, furnished by **CHARLES M. BOGERT**

The following is in reply to your letter of 21st September with reference to Project No. 5, namely, the problems concerned with the names of higher categories. As on previous occasions, I have discussed the various questions with other members of the Museum staff here. On the whole, we think that the statement by Mr. Hemming is sensible and constructive. In some instances technical details are put ahead of principles, and the language is sometimes legalistic to the point of being obscure, but we would comment on the questions raised as follows, taking them up in order :

---

[3] Apodes is not on this list because it is objectionable on two grounds. First, certain unrelated fishes have at various times been placed under this name, e.g., Kaup's "Apodal Fishes ". Second, the name is too similar to the Apoda of Amphibia.

(1) With reference to taxonomic categories above the Family level, I can see no objection to having a type genus for each. As I see it, it is actually immaterial whether a type family or a type genus is chosen as long as it is clearly stated which zoological object is considered as the typical representative of the group in question.

(2) In the case of Orders and Sub-Orders, the names should not be co-ordinate. A name proposed as a Sub-Order should not, on promotion, take precedence over a name later proposed for the Order. If it were, this might well be made the starting point for a terrific upheaval on the excuse of priority, which Hemming himself rules out in subsequent statements.

(3) Latinised names used to denote groups above the Family level should be treated as though they had been published as Ordinal or Sub-Ordinal names. Hence they should have priority over names later proposed as such, even though the latter may definitely have been identified as being Ordinal or Sub-Ordinal. After all, the whole concept of the Order came into being gradually, and it would be nonsense to become legalistic about it at this belated date. This threatened upheaval might perhaps be avoided if there were some sort of preamble to the statement concerning higher categories to the effect that " higher categories are of the greatest importance not only to specialists, but also to all other biologists and even to the laymen. A change of well established names of higher categories merely for the sake of consistency or priority would be intolerable and do untold harm to the prestige of systematics. Well established Ordinal names, if their author is to be determined, may be traced back to the first usage of the stem of his name as a higher category, regardless of the ending used by the author originally ".

(4) Vigorous provisions might well be inserted in the Code, specifying the procedure to be followed if a name for a higher category is to be proposed. It might, for example, be demanded that the name of a new Order be valid henceforth only where introduced by a statement specifically designating it as a new Order.

(5) Any rigid rule for determining the special termination to be used in forming a new Ordinal name might well result in chaos. The name or status of an Order should not be affected if it is transferred to a different Class. In the case of subdivisions of existing groups, the name for each subdivision when advanced to a higher category, should not of necessity have the ending changed. The substitution of a new (and for each group a uniform) ending will inevitably result in the duplication of many generic names in the higher categories. Hence, it would seem preferable that specialists be given some leeway.

(6) The Code might well provide some means of citing authorship and date for names of Orders, but there is no necessity for any provision to indicate that the name, as originally published, had an incorrect termination. If need be, the author can cite the original spelling in parentheses, but any rule

requiring this would place an unbearable burden of bibliographic search on every user of Ordinal names.

(7) With reference to Ordinal names and the law of priority, those now in general use should not be jeopardised by any rule concerning priority. However, it might well be stated that Ordinal names introduced after a specified date will be subject to priority, with possible exceptions arising from conflicting names when Orders are combined.

(8) Questions concerning homonymy in Ordinal names should be referred to the Commission for decision after consultation with specialists in the groups concerned.

(9) The availability of Ordinal names published after the introduction of any scheme should be determined by applying the law of priority.

(10) Thus far no two people have read the section dealing with homonymy between Ordinal and Generic names and arrived at the same interpretation. Hence, the suggestion does not meet with general approval since it is not generally understandable. If the question is primarily concerned with conflict between Ordinal and Generic names, there may be need for concern. As a result of setting up unifor mendings for each category above the Family, a good many generic names will be duplicated in those for the higher categories—to judge by the set of names gotten out years ago by Pearse's Committee (and as noted under (5)).

(11) Hemming's draft omits the important question of the procedure to be followed when Orders are combined. Priority should not be the deciding principle in the case of such well known groups as Orders. When there is a conflict of two Ordinal names caused by combining two Orders, the name of the better known one of the two should be chosen. In most cases this would be the name of the larger of the two combined Orders. In cases of doubt, the matter could be settled by the Commission.

To eliminate all further wrangling concerning the names of categories higher than the family, it is suggested that the International Commission publish a list of such names. In view of the fact that it is often difficult to get authoritative lists for some Classes or Phyla, it is further suggested that such a list be published piecemeal.

As far as the question of endings is concerned, we would suggest a policy as liberal as possible. It seems virtually impossible to reach any agreement among specialists as to the ranking of higher categories. In ornithological circles, for example, Wetmore recognises about 20 Orders, Streseman 49 Orders, whereas Mayr and Amadon, who are quite as authoritative as the others, recognise only 29 Orders. These Orders are to a lesser or greater degree subdivided into Sub-Orders and combined into Super-Orders. No two authorities use the same ranking for the same units. Incidentally, Hemming is quite mistaken in his belief that the ending -formes is universally used by ornithologists. It isn't, and the use of uniform endings makes a continuous shifting up and down of the units involved even more confusing.

APPENDIX 3 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

Statement, dated 26th September, 1951, furnished by

WILLIAM A. GOSLINE

By way of preamble, I look upon Linnaean nomenclature as merely a tool to zoological work. As such it diminishes rapidly in effectiveness with increase in the amount of time necessary to master the use of it. Because of this, Rules of Nomenclature should be kept to a minimum.

Regarding the names of the various systematic levels, I feel that they belong in three indistinctly defined categories. The highest—Kingdom and Phylum—are the province of the general zoologist. There are relatively few names here, mostly of long standing, and these names, if satisfactory to zoologists, should be maintained. The application of systems or rules of nomenclature to these categories is gratuitous.

At the other end we have genera and species. These are legion, and without the application of the rules there would be endless duplication and confusion.

In between are the categories under discussion, centred around Order. These are neither well known to the general zoologist nor so numerous that there is much duplication of names. (The instances where there is duplication could be worked out individually if this were felt necessary.) Since there is no great problem raised by whatever is done, why not let the specialists in the individual groups take care of the Ordinal (Sub-Ordinal, etc.) names of their groups in any way they see fit ? If the problems of Ordinal naming in all groups were similar, a uniform method of naming all Orders might be to advantage. But they are not. Each zoological group has its own problems of Ordinal nomenclature depending upon the number of Orders in the group, the stability of these Orders, the stability of the names used for these Orders, and the number of workers in the field. Consequently I feel that to try to apply a single set of rules or a single system to all Ordinal names would merely cause immediate confusion without adequate compensation in the long run. Besides, as a zoologist I rather like the use of different systems in different groups ; the ending *-ptera* for example immediately indicates to me that an Order of Insects is involved, etc.

I suspect the earlier Commissioners were silent as to rules for the naming of higher categories for reasons very similar to those advanced above, and not, as Hemming writes, because " at the time when the Règles were established, the task of grappling with the problems involved in nomenclature up to Family level were such as to leave zoologists with insufficient energy to tackle the problem of the nomenclature of the higher categories ".

I do not mean to imply that there is nothing the Commission could do to alleviate certain nomenclatorial problems in the higher categories.

APPENDIX 4 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

Statement furnished by **CARL L. HUBBS**

UNIFORM GROUP ENDINGS

In his judicious and forceful discussion, " For and Against Uniform Endings in Zoological Nomenclature ", in the opening number of *Systematic Zoology* (pp. 20–23), George Gaylord Simpson pays particular attention to the recent proposal by H. B. Stenzel (*Science*, **112**, p. 94, 1950) that nine uniform name endings be adopted for Ordinal (-ica, -ida, -ina), Familial (-icae, -idae, -inae), and Tribal (-ici, -idi, -ini) groups. That proposal is so alluring in its simplicity, consistency, and logic as to inspire, on first thought, agreement and adoption. It received support, for example, from the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists at its 1951 meeting, particularly from the ichthyologists present, the writer included (the herpetologists were particularly opposed to the abandonment of their relatively few and well-known Ordinal names).

On more thoughtful and analytical consideration, Simpson points out how confusion and even error might well arise from the acceptance, for groups of different rank, of names so very similar as Hominica, Hominida, Hominina, Hominicae, Hominidae, Homininae, Hominici, Hominidi, and Hominini. I would like to bring to the attention of systematic zoologists a more definite defect of Stenzel's proposal, namely, that it would deprive us of the use, now frequent and desirable, of definitive group names in adjectival and derived substantival form, or would throw such usage into hopeless confusion. Thus, if we should write about " poeciliid " fishes (or gonopodia, or life-history), or of the distribution, genetics, or anatomy of the " poeciliids ", it could not be known, under the system advocated by Stenzel, whether reference was to the Order Poeciliida, the Family Poeciliidae, or the Tribe Poeciliidi. Under the current system we write about cyprinodonts (or poecilioids, or microcyprines), poeciliids, and poeciliins, when referring respectively to Order, Family and Tribe (the subfamily adjective is poeciliine).

It would, of course, be possible to devise a system of uniform group-name endings, through at least the Ordinal series, that would be less confusingly alike and that would permit the derivative of distinctive adjectives (and of the corresponding vernacular substantives). Objections raised specifically to the system of Stenzel could thus be avoided. Other objections, such as that of supplanting literature-filled and familiar group names, would remain. An additional and fundamental disadvantage of the Stenzel proposal, or of any similar system of boxing the zoological compass, seems to me to be the inherent emphasis on group ranking, which I regard as a particularly subjective, superficial, and inconsequential (though perhaps unavoidable) aspect of taxonomic work.

APPENDIX 5 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

Statement, dated 10th October, 1951, furnished by

ROBERT R. MILLER

HIGHER CATEGORIES

It seems to me, in view of the action that has already been taken by the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists' Committee on Fish Classification (*Copeia*, 1951, No. 1, p. 111) and by the Society itself (as reflected in the June 1, 1951, ballot by our Committee), that there are two phases to this problem. One is what recommendations does the Committee on Zoological Nomenclature have to make for the major group Pisces, and the other is what recommendations are in order for the whole field of Zoology. I will take up these phases in order.

Evidently it has been pretty well agreed (1) that American ichthyologists and herpetologists propose to form higher categories, from Sub-Tribe through Super-Family, by adding the appropriate Stenzel ending to the stem of the type genus of the type family and (2) that the names of Orders, Sub-Orders and Super-Orders are to have their appropriate Stenzel endings but what these are to be tacked on to is not clear. Why the Commission asked Hemming to consider only the nomenclature of Sub-Orders, Orders and higher categories (and not those down to Sub-Tribe) I am not certain.

Hemming's point that terminations decided upon for Sub-Orders, Orders and higher categories need not and will not be identical throughout the animal kingdom is down-to-earth reasoning. I would strongly oppose, for example, changing the name Coleoptera to Scarabaeida, and I can therefore well imagine how entomologists would feel about such a change !

My feeling is that this whole problem would be gratifyingly simplified by employing the stem of the type genus of the type family throughout fish classification. And I think further that if the members of the ASIH had been aware of the headaches in store for the poor nomenclaturalist if a single stem is not used for all categories, the membership would have voted affirmatively on this point in the recent ballot. For example, if we follow Berg's selection of the genus *Clupea*, family Clupeidae, as the type genus and family for the Order Isospondyli, or *Cyprinus*, family Cyprinidae, for Ostariophysi our headaches are cured. For now we need not fret over such horrifying prospects as outlined in items 2–4 and 6–10 of Hemming's letter. Thus we would not have to be concerned over priority in the naming of higher categories or whether Orders and Sub-Orders should be co-ordinate, etc. This system, if adopted by the majority of ichthylogists, would of course solve only our (the fish people's) problems. For other zoological groups, I comment on Hemming's suggestions below.

In order to determine, for nomenclatorial purposes, the identity of higher categories (Sub-Order on up), I recommend that every such group have a type family in groups where families are recognised and a type genus in other cases (item (1), choice (1) of p. 2 of Hemming's letter).

I would not favour strict co-ordination of Ordinal and Sub-Ordinal names. Thus a name proposed for a Sub-Order in 1850, if elevated to Ordinal rank in 1880, should not displace (take precedence over) a name published for the same group in 1860, particularly if the latter name is in general use. I agree with George Myers (Circular 2, Committee on Fish Classification, February 1950) that no widely accepted current Family or Sub-Family name (and on up through Orders) should be displaced by a more obscure one. The Law of Priority should hold except in such instances. In other words, I favour only a partially operative Law of Priority. (Hemming, item (2).)

If Latin or latinised words used in the older literature to denote groups above the family level are clearly demonstrable as referring to a particular category (Order, Sub-Order, etc.), even if that category is not so designated, I am in favour of recognising such names as available. (Hemming, item (3).)

My feeling is to favour Hemming's proposal in item (4), that a type genus (or family) should be designated by the author publishing a new Ordinal or Sub-Ordinal name—after the effective date of the new scheme.

Item (5) is already answered above, with the recommendation that ichthyologists use the Stenzel system throughout. I think that the shifting interpretation of classes, as the " class Pisces " is largely academic, is zoological, and is beyond the intended jurisdiction of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

Item (6) is definitely not recommended for fishes (by which term I include fish-like vertebrates). I'm not certain about other groups though I am inclined to register a " no ".

With respect to item (7), regarding Ordinal names and the Law of Priority, I don't feel that such a law should be put into effect here as there would be so many exceptions to it that would have to be made that the " law " would be very ineffective. Moreover, the Commission would have to be petitioned for each exception, thus burdening both that body and zoologists and reducing the effectiveness of the Rules.

Item (8) depends, in part, on whether zoologists feel that homonymy is undesirable in family and other names below the level of the Sub-Order. Personally I feel it best to eliminate homonymy in Family names but question the desirability of this for Ordinal names.

My answer to item (8) automatically provides for an answer to item (9).

The problem brought up in item (10) is more fundamental. Of course, if ichthyologists adopt the type genus concept plus Stenzel's endings for all categories above the genus, we have no further worries, except that would we not then violate Hemming's point (*b*) ? I would not want to see a new generic name proposed which was the basis of an already existing Ordinal name, particularly if the new generic name was not proposed in the same order. This sort of situation should be guarded against.

In Hemming's section "*Alternative lines of approach*" (pp. 5–6 of his letter), I find his proposal of an "Official List of the Names of Orders and Higher Systematic Categories in Zoology" much the more attractive of his two schemes.

This whole problem, as Hemming freely admits, is most complex and difficult and, unfortunately, there is not a great deal of time left to consider it with the care it deserves, for the Copenhagen Congress will all too soon be upon us.

APPENDIX 6 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

Statement furnished by
HOBART M. SMITH

Enclosure 1 to Appendix 6

Letter dated 7th November, 1951

HIGHER CATEGORIES

The overwhelming complications, lack of any very obvious solutions, and my lack of prior opinion have caused me to procrastinate a reply to your letter of 21st September. If committee progress has been delayed because of this, the reply herewith will release you from obligation to wait still longer.

The task of laying down rules governing Higher Categories seems a hopeless one. The prospect of the never-ending bickering that would be sure to follow attempts to establish rules of procedure offers little inducement to change from our present system, without rules, of playing follow-the-leader.

Stability of names—the objective in the present investigation—is not going to be achieved even at best in those groups (and there are many) in which the number and relative position of major categories is not yet convincingly established. Rules could be worked out that would benefit certain Classes that are well known (perhaps Aves only?), but whether they would be the most practical rules for other groups could not be known until the problems were known—and they would not be known until the groups that should be recognised are worked out.

Rather than try to anticipate every problem that may arise, when after all these names will tend more than species and genera to be individual cases meriting separate examination, why not simplify matters by establishment of an Official List as Hemming suggested ? This should be done in co-operation with specialists in each field, and as they agree themselves upon the names desired. Names entered in the Official List for one group should have priority over homonyms brought forward in other groups, so duplication will be avoided. Specialists should be advised to let their choices be governed by a series of *recommendations* (not rules), some of which might be :

1. Higher categories are to be considered completely independently of each other. Sub-Ordinal names are not, for example, interchangeable with Ordinal names. The taxonomic equivalence of generic and subgeneric names thus should not apply to similar combinations of higher categories, simply because of the frequent shifts of rank that has occurred in higher categories.

2. No names not clearly used at the rank at which they are now to be recognised are to be considered. Old group names of uncertain rank are not to be considered unless they have been later adopted for a specified rank ; they are then to be treated as of the latter date.

3. Terminations need not be consistent within any one group, although uniformity should be attained insofar as is painlessly possible.

4. Authors of higher categories should be determined as of the earliest use of the name at any rank now recognised. Use at a rank now recognised should not invalidate it. Original use should establish priority for rank—the name should not be used for a Sub-Order, for example if it was first proposed for an Order.

In conjunction with establishment of the *Official List* the following simple rules might be desirable :

1. Type families, etc., for higher categories need not be established. If the original author designates them, they should be recognised, but not otherwise. When a group is split, retention or rejection of the original name for any of the resultant groups should be decided by common usage, or in future practice by submission of the proposed allocations to the Commission for inclusion on the Official List.

2. Future authors should be required to designate types for the higher categories they may propose.

3. Homonyms in higher categories, in existing names, should be eliminated by priority of acceptance by the Commission for the Official List.

4. New homonyms should be eliminated in like manner.

5. Ordinal (and higher category) names identical with recognised generic names should arbitrarily be altered in termination so as to differ in spelling from the genus, as for example if there were both a genus and order Apoda the Ordinal name might be changed to Apodina.

Enclosure 2 to Appendix 6

Letter dated 14th July, 1952

NAMING OF ORDERS AND HIGHER CATEGORIES

All of the items received with your letter could, and should, receive Mr. Hemming's attention, providing their authors agree. Since no general agreement or statement by our committee has been achieved on this topic, however, I suppose it would be best to submit these items as solely personal statements of the originators. The members of the committee are in a position to offer personal support for any one or more of the items, and I suppose these should be passed on.

In general, I agree with the sentiment of the three items you sent. Yet I do not care to admit complete approval of all of any one, and it would be useless to treat the parts of each in detail. Instead, I would like to suggest that we need now a plan of procedure which will make possible an orderly, if slow, progression toward a satisfactory solution.

As a mode of operation, it seems to me that the first objective should be a determination of the ideally most desirable endings for higher category names. This should be done with no intent of a universal or even general application of the selected endings. As part and parcel of this selection, a decision should certainly be made on the controversial but very important topic of the nature of the type, if any, for each category.

Secondly, upon the premise that an even general application of (1) would be undesirable (which has been admitted seemingly by everyone) and that a real contribution toward stability and practicality is the desired end (admitted perforce by all, with or without tongue in cheek), let only those names or groups of names be arbitrated that the specialists in the groups concerned agree need rectification.

Thirdly, a mechanism for motivating consideration of the questionable names or groups of names should be determined. I suggest that only when a group of five specialists from one or no more than two countries requests the Commission to arbitrate the names can they be considered by the Commission; that only if 10 other specialists from at least five other countries approve the announced possible arbitration can actual steps be taken to arbitrate; that a committee of specialists agree upon one or more alternatives in the controversy to be voted upon by the Commission; and that selections by the committee, and final choice by the Commission, be guided as much as possible by the endings selected under step (1) described above.

Fourthly, an official recommendation, but not requirement, should be made by the Commission that all newly proposed names parallel as much as possible the endings selected in step (1) above.

I suspect that these suggestions are not particularly appropriate, and if so by all means suppress or use them as you desire. If appropriate, you of course have my permission to pass them on to Mr. Hemming.

APPENDIX 7 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

Statement, dated 2nd November, 1951, furnished by

NORMAN J. WILLIMOVSKY

The following notes were abstracted from the tape recordings made during our impromptu meeting last Friday. These, as you will remember, all concern Project 5 (higher categories). More specifically, the first of the remarks apply to Hemming's letter dated 9th August, 1951. The second set of remarks merely apply to the subject as a whole because the group decided to have the committee prepare a new report on the topic.

Question 1.—For the purpose of identification of taxonomic categories, it was decided definitely that a type was to be specified. Hubbs contended that the type should be chosen from the next lower category employed in the group, whereas Myers preferred that, in each case, a genus be made the type.

Question 2.—It was generally agreed that in the case of Sub-Orders and Orders the names be designated as co-ordinate (as in the case of species and sub-species) inasmuch as it is usually impossible to determine at just what nomenclatorial level a group name was originally proposed.

Question 3.—The means for determining when an older group name has been established : Myers stated on the basis of personal experience, that a committee who have a knowledge of both the fishes and the nomenclatorial practices of the authors under consideration would have to decide just when the various group terms were established and to what nomenclatorial level they pertain.

Question 4.—Means for determining when a name has been established in the case of future proposals : the only conclusion reached was that after a given date, *if* the type system be employed, a new provision be instituted in the International Code, which requires an author to state what taxonomic group forms the type of his new name.

Question 5.—On the basis of Follett's analysis and interpretation of this question, it was generally agreed that there be no need to indicate changes in the contents of a systematic group by placing its author's name in parentheses, etc. This was largely decided because of the difficulty in determining what is included in a particular group when such a name is employed in a faunal list.

A general principle was discussed in connection with Question 5, namely, it was generally agreed that no matter how much a systematic group be split up, the original name should always refer to a group which contains the original nucleus (e.g. *Beryx* should always be a part of the group designated Berycomorphi).

Questions 6–11 were unanswered.

General considerations.—One of the first questions to be decided is whether priority or usage should be employed with regard to the higher group names. Hubbs suggests priority except where confusion will result. It would be a degree of priority as opposed to wholly custom. The results of a poll of the SSZ should be examined on this question. Myers suggested that committees be established to decide the question of priority or usage. These specialists would act as " lower courts " and only in disputed cases would their decisions be referred to the International Commission. Thus the Commission would not be bogged down with endless paper work. This plan was generally conceded the most logical manner of handling the problem inasmuch as Hubbs and Follett showed concern over Hemming's choice of specialist groups.

The problem of uniform endings for higher groups was also raised. Hubbs expressed the following disadvantage of the Stenzel system—the impossibility of forming distinct group adjectives in the English and German languages (e.g. scorpaenine for subfamilies, scorpaenid for families, etc.). Myers voiced the disadvantage that certain subordinal names would be spelled the same as generic names, thus requiring a listing of the actual category in systematic papers. (*Percina* would be name used for the genus and the Sub-Order.)

There was considerable discussion by all the members (principally Follett) over the validity of the results of the Society's vote concerning the naming of higher categories. Consequently no decision was reached by the group present concerning the use of the stem of a type to be employed in the naming of higher groups. It was decided to put the question of what type should be used for a higher group name before the A.S.I.H. Committee on Nomenclature. The viewpoints of Myers and Hubbs to be clearly expressed in the presentation of the problem. Hubbs and Myers both restated their cases for this purpose.

Myers' statement.—A committee be appointed to go through the older literature to examine each name and decide to which nomenclatorial level a group name belongs. It would be easier to then take a central genus of the group and make that the type rather to try and find what other subordinate groups are included, from which a type might be chosen.

Myers and Hubbs both suggest that these older nomenclatorial categories be superimposed on the current nomenclatorial hierarchy in order that we may then consider and treat ordinal terms (Sub-Order, Order and Super-Order) as co-ordinate.

Myers terminated his statement by stating that it would be much easier when going through the old names to pick out a genus than to pick out the next subordinate category in selecting a type for the group name under consideration.

Hubbs' statement.—Hubbs reiterated the need for superimposing the older names on the current nomenclatorial system. Then having this as a basis one can choose the type of a particular group name from the next lower nomenclatorial category *employed* in that group. He pointed out that if the genus be used as a type, then that genus might serve as the type for all higher group names (e.g. *Squalus* would serve as the type genus for the family Squalidae, the Order Squaloidea and possibly could be the type through a much higher group which included the sharks, rays and chimeras). The result would be, there would be no way of distinguishing between the composition of these groups.

Hubbs suggested that all proposals of a new group name should state : (1) its characters ; (2) what is included in it ; (3) of what higher category it is a constituent.

Hubbs and Myers then expressed the opinion that the actual nomenclatorial category of a name in the hierarchy is really of little significance and the higher the name in the system the less significant is the group name and the value of its type. They further stated the difficulty if not impossibility of formulating a rule which would govern cases where the contents of a systematic group have been so changed as to warrant the application of a new name (i.e. just how much must be subtracted or added to a category before the name must be changed). Each case must be governed by good judgment, common sense, and practice.

APPENDIX 8 TO DR. FOLLETT'S LETTER

Statement, dated 15th July, 1952, furnished by **ROBERT C. STEBBINS**

As regards names of Orders and higher categories, I am of the opinion that they should be worked out for each major group of animals largely by the zoologists working in the group. Thus, I am in essential agreement with the anonymous author whose comments you present in your letter of 5th July. I believe this article* as well as the Hubbs† and Willlimovsky‡ letters should go to the Commission.

---

* See Appendix 1 (pp. 42–46).
† See Appendix 4 (p. 50).
‡ See Appendix 7 (pp. 56–58).

DOCUMENT 4/24

Statement of the views of

ENTOMOLOGISCHE GESELLSCHAFT, BASEL

Extract from a letter, dated 30th July, 1952, from M. HENRY BEURET

Vol. 7, Part 4

Paras. No. 1–20 Rien à objecter (pages 97–108).

DOCUMENT 4/25

By **J. CHESTER BRADLEY** (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

Statement received on 30th July, 1952

Editorial Note : Dr. Chester Bradley's statement is not reproduced here, for it was adopted without amendment by the American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature and, as such, was communicated by Professor Charles D. Michener under cover of a letter dated 24th July, 1952, and has been included in the present series as Document 4/22.

DOCUMENT 4/26

By **W. E. CHINA,** M.A., D.Sc. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*)

Extract from a letter dated 20th August, 1952

REF. Z.N.(S.) 360 (ORDINAL, ETC. NAMES)

In general, I am in agreement with your proposals but would prefer Alternative No. 2 in paragraph 19 (page 107), whereby the rationalisation of the higher taxonomic categories would not be subject to hard and fast rules but would depend on individual judgment by the Commission on the application of specialists, its final decisions to be incorporated in an *Official List of Valid Major Group Names*.

DOCUMENT 4/27

By **K. H. L. KEY**

(*Commonwealth Scientific and Research Organisation, Division of Entomology, Canberra, Australia*)

Extract from a letter dated 4th September, 1952

> Note :—The main portion of the above letter was concerned with the problem of the emendation of names, on which a separate paper has been submitted by Dr. Key and which constitutes Document 5/26 of the Copenhagen Series.

I have studied your proposals in connection with the other six questions referred to you by the Thirteenth Congress, and in general I find myself in hearty agreement with them.

DOCUMENT 4/28

Statement furnished by the
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PARASITOLOGISTS

Extract from a letter dated 8th September, 1952

The American Society of Parasitologists at its meeting in November of 1951 appointed a committee to investigate the controversy that arose following the announcement that " far-reaching decisions in regard to zoological nomenclature (had been) taken by the Thirteenth International Congress ".

In undertaking its assignment the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* was studied and the requests for advice in Volume 7 were noticed. The committee reached a unanimous decision on only three points*.

(1) The committee believes that it is better to have no rules to govern the use of names above the familial level.

. . . . .

In submitting these comments to you the Society wishes to express its gratitude to you and the entire International Commission for the considerable effort that has been expended in behalf of zoological nomenclature.

Signed for the Society by its Committee

ALLEN McINTOSH

D. H. WENRICH

G. W. WHARTON, *Chairman*

PURCHASED
30 JUN 1953

---

* *Ed. Note* :—The other points here referred to are given at the appropriate points in the present volume.

Authors of papers published, or otherwise dealt with, in the present Part

	Page
American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature	36
American Museum of Natural History, New York, Committee on Nomenclature of	23
American Society of Parasitologists	60
Arkell, W. J.	16
Ashby, the late Edwin	3
Baily, Jr., Joshua L.	20
Bogert, Charles M.	46
Bradley, J. Chester	28, 30, 59
China, W. E.	59
Daniel, Franz	12
Dymond, J. R.	16
Entomologische Gesellschaft, Basel	59
Follett, W. I.	33, 42
Forster, Walter	19
Gosline, William A.	49
Hall, E. Raymond	27
Haltenorth, Th.	13
Harmer, the late Sir Sidney	3
Hemming, Francis	3
Hering, E. M.	19
Herzog, Jesus Silva	4
Holthuis, L. B.	11
Hopkins, G. H. E.	9
Hubbs, Carl L.	50
Keen, A. Myra	22
Key, K. H. L.	59
Kiriakoff, S. G.	18
Lemche, Henning	24
Michener, Charles D.	33
Miller, Robert R.	51
Moure, Pe. Jesus	4
Muller, Siemon W.	22
Royal Ontario Museum of Natural History, Toronto, Scientific Staff of	21
Sabrosky, Curtis W.	32
Schultz, Leonard P.	5
Smith, Hobart M.	53
Society of Systematic Zoology, Nomenclature Committee of	28
Stebbins, Robert C.	58
Townes, Henry	33
Travassos Filho, L.	4
Usinger, Robert L.	28, 30
Wells, John W.	34
Willimovsky, Norman J.	56
Zimmer, John T.	34

Printed in England by Metcalfe & Cooper Limited, 10-24 Scrutton St., London E C 2

VOLUME 10. Triple Part 3/5
Pp. 61—166

23rd July, 1953

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of
THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by
FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Copenhagen Discussions, Case No. 5 :
Emendation of Zoological Names

LONDON:
Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1953

Price Two Pounds, Ten Shillings

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)
Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming
Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.
Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Parts 3/5 (pp. 61–166) 23rd July, 1953

CASE No. 5

DOCUMENTS RELEVANT TO THE CONSIDERATION OF THE PROBLEM OF THE EMENDATION OF NAMES

DOCUMENT 5/1

ORIGIN OF THE PRESENT INVESTIGATION

The present investigation into the problem of the emendation of zoological names was undertaken in response to a request addressed to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at Paris in July, 1948, when, after considering problems arising in connection with the consolidation into the *Règles* of interpretations of Article 19 given in certain of the *Opinions* previously rendered, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature agreed to recommend (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 141) :—

> "(1) that the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to make a thorough study, in consultation with interested specialists, of the problems involved in the emendation of scientific names which, when originally published, contained errors of transcription or of orthography or printers' errors and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration by the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission of proposals for the insertion in the *Règles* of comprehensive provisions dealing with this subject."

2. The foregoing recommendation, with other recommendations, was submitted to, and approved by, the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its Second Meeting held on 24th July, 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 67, 76).

DOCUMENT 5/2

GENERAL CONSULTATION WITH SPECIALISTS AND ISSUE OF AN APPEAL FOR ADVICE IN 1952

Editorial Note : Attention is drawn to the review by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of the problems involved in the emendation of zoological names which was published in March, 1952 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 4–59). This review contained an appeal to specialists to assist in the present investigation by furnishing statements of their views on the action which it was desirable should be taken. It was in response to this appeal that the majority of the documents now submitted was furnished.

DOCUMENT 5/3

By **RAYMOND C. MOORE**
(*University of Kansas, Lawrence, U.S.A.*)

Letter, dated 5th February, 1947

OBJECTION TO THE EMENDATION OF NAMES ON ETYMOLOGICAL GROUNDS

This letter is written to raise question concerning the validity under the International Rules of orthographic emendation by Lang, Smith and Thomas (" Index of Palaeozoic Coral Genera ", Brit. Mus., p. 1–231, 1940) of some 69 generic names of Paleozoic corals out of 564 such genera recognized by them, all or virtually all such changes in spelling being on etymological grounds. Examples are *Aenignatophyllum* L. S. & T., 1940, for *Enygmophyllum* Fomichev, 1931 ; *Polydiselasma* L. S. & T., 1940, for *Polydilasma* Hall, 1851 ; and *Strobilelesma* L. S. & T., 1940, for *Strobilasma* Scheffen, 1933.

Is faulty transliteration of Greek roots by an original author of a generic name construed to be " une faute de transcription " or " d'orthographe " according to Article 19 of the *Règles* ? Various *Opinions* of the Commission seem unequivocally to indicate that failure on the part of an author to follow procedure recommended in Appendix F for transliteration of Greek letters does not constitute an infringement of the Rules. *Opinion* 76 gives no hint that *Oikopleura* must be written *Oecopleura* ; *Opinion* 81 cites *Clinophilus* 1903 as a junior synonym of *Klinophilos* 1899 ; *Opinion* 125 declares that *Boros* 1797 cannot be emended legally to *Borus* as was attempted by Agassiz in 1846 on etymological basis presumably. Commissioner Richter (1943, Senckenb. Nat. Ges., " Einfuhrung in die zoologische Nomenklatur ", p. 86) says : " Anderungen nur deswegen vorzunehmen, weil die Transliteration von griechischen Buchstaben nicht auf die Anhang F empfohlene, aber nicht vorgeschriebene Weise vorgenommen worden ist, hat die Kommission abgelehnt ". Richter's comment on *Opinion* 125 therewith published is also pertinent.

It is confusing and disturbing, then, to read your discussion and see your volte-face in the case of *Sphingonothus* vs. *Sphingonotus* (*Opinions* etc., vol. 2, pt. 30A, p. (17), 1945). Here the conclusion is reached that " *Sphingonothus* " represents an error of orthography and accordingly emendation to " *Sphingonotus* " is judged valid. I may note parenthetically that no evidence seems to have been submitted to show that the *original* publication of *Sphingonothus* (1852) contains within itself internal evidence of a misprint or other cause for emendation under Article 19, and if it is true that no such evidence exists, *Opinion* 34 declares that the originally published spelling must stand.

An important question that seems to be quite unanswered as yet, is definition of what constitutes a " faute d'orthographe " in the meaning of the Rules. The reasoning given in accepting *Sphingonotus* is surely not less applicable as support for the many (decidedly unsettling) emendations of coral genera by Lang, Smith and Thomas. In scholarly manner these authors have correctly transliterated Greek roots, used proper classical connectives, and otherwise achieved flawless orthography, whereas original authors of many generic names of corals made errors (or we judge that they did). It is certainly possible, however, to make more than one " correct " emendation of some names, root terms being unspecified. A strong reason, it seems to me, for objecting to any alteration of generic names in this manner is its disturbing effect on already published generic names that have validity under the Rules and that occupy the role of innocent bystanders. For example, Lang, Smith and Thomas find that some emended spellings introduced by them conflict with a previously proposed name, which they then conclude must be discarded as a homonym. Thus, *Arachnophyllum* Dana, 1846, is altered to *Arachniophyllum* Lang, Smith & Thomas, 1940, which conflicts with *Arachniophyllum* Smyth, 1915 and they suppress the latter (incorrectly, I think) as a homonym of Dana's generic name. Should we not recognize *Arachnophyllum* Dana and *Arachniophyllum* Smyth despite their similarity (assuming each is available under the Rules) inasmuch as the names apply to entirely different corals ? *Arachniophyllum* Lang, Smith & Thomas, 1940 constitutes an invalid junior homonym of Smyth's *Arachniophyllum* 1915.

Many American paleontologists are interested in the nomenclatorial problem that is illustrated by the emendations cited in this letter. Your assistance in resolving the problem definitively is solicited.

DOCUMENT 5/4

Professor **PIERRE BONNET'S** proposal regarding the spelling to be adopted for a word for which more than one spelling is in use

Note by the Secretary

Editorial Note : Attention is drawn to the proposition No. 10 submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet at Paris in 1948. This proposal was published in the present serial publication in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 190).

The proposal submitted by Professor Bonnet was that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a new Article (Article 20bis) which would read as follows:—

> Article 20bis.—Polymorphisme de cartains mots. Si certains mots ont été écrits de plusieurs façons on doit adopter cette qui a une priorité originelle. *Exemples : silva* non *silva* ; *tirol* non *tyrol* ; *littoralis* non *litoralis* ; *caeruleus* non *coeruleus* et surtout non *ceruleus* ; *sulfur* non *sulphur* ; *compta* non *comta* ; *hibernalis* non *hybernalis* ; *pirum* non *pyrum.*

DOCUMENT 5/5

By the late **LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO**

(*University of Parma, Italy*)

Statement, dated 15th January, 1948

COMMENT UPON PROFESSOR P. BONNET'S PROPOSITION No. 10

In his Proposal No. 10,* Professor P. Bonnet recommends the addition to the *Règles* of a new Article (Article 20bis) providing that, if a name is spelt by different authors in different ways, the spelling to be used is that employed in the original publication.

With this proposal I am in full agreement for the sake of uniformity.

---

* See Document D. 5/4.

DOCUMENT 5/6

PROPOSALS IN A REPORT BY A SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION COMMITTEE ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE PUBLISHED IN JULY, 1948

Editorial Note : Attention is drawn to the fact that in July, 1948 (*Science* **108** (No. 2793) : 37–38) there was published a Report containing proposals for the amendment and clarification of Article 19 of the *Règles* prepared by a Sub-Committee of the Smithsonian Institution Committee on Zoological Nomenclature. The final draft of the foregoing document was communicated to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in 1948 under cover of a letter (dated 7th July, 1948) from Dr. Richard E. Blackwelder.

2. The foregoing Report was submitted to the International Commission in 1952 in a slightly revised form (under cover of a letter dated 16th July, 1952, signed by Dr. Blackwelder) by the Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington (the reconstituted form of the previous Smithsonian Institution Committee). As so submitted, the Report referred to above is reproduced in the present Series as Annexe 2 to Document 5/30.

DOCUMENT 5/7

By **JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr.** (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

Letter dated 29th July, 1948

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSALS BROUGHT FORWARD BY A SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION COMMITTEE ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE IN 1948

Editorial Note : *The paper published in* Science *referred to by Mr. Baily in the following letter is the Report by a Sub-Committee of the Smithsonian Institution Committee on Zoological Nomenclature referred to in Document 5/6.*

In the issue of *Science* for 9th July, 1948 there is an announcement of a proposed change in rules in Articles 19 and 20, with the request that taxonomists write you to express their views on the proposed changes. I take it that these proposed changes will be published in the *Bulletin* before they are acted upon, but inasmuch as they have already appeared in *Science* it would seem preferable for anyone feeling as strongly as I do to write at once.

In the case of Article 19 dealing with the use of diacritical marks I feel that it is preferable not to have optional spellings. Every word should have one correct form which should be adhered to. However, no final action should be taken precipitously because the question as to what the best orthography would be for special cases is one of very great complexity.

The function of diacritical marks * is to modify the sound or the significance of a letter so as to differentiate it from the same letter without the diacritical marks. The effect of authorising optional forms would be to neutralize the value of the diacritical mark, and this could best be done by ruling them out altogether. But I am not sure that it is practical to rule out all diacritical marks.

Another thing which must be remembered is that the same diacritical mark may mean different things in different languages. The umlaut in German is the same symbol as the diaeresis in the Roman languages, but it indicates a different modification of the vowel over which it is placed. Since scientific names are written in Latin it would seem logical to use this symbol as a diaeresis and not an umlaut. An alternative form for the umlaut is the addition of the vowel " e " as in the name Müller which may be spelled also Mueller. The objection to this orthography is the same. The vowel combination " ae " has a different meaning and a different sound in Latin than it has in

---

* See Document 5/17.

German, and the Latin use should be preserved. This leaves a need for some other way of transliterating the modified German vowels. This might be done merely by dropping the umlaut altogether, but I am not sure that it would be advisable to drop all diacritical marks of all other languages without first devising something to take their places.

My feeling is that as long as Latin is used for scientific nomenclature the Latin rules, either of classical Latin, or of Neo-Latin should be adhered to. Also, since the true word is not a combination of printed marks on a paper but a spoken sound, that the scientific name be spelled phonetically, and the great advantage of the Latin language is that it is a phonetic language and has but one spelling for each sound and but one sound for each spelling. In this respect it is very unlike English where the letter " a " may have as many as nine different sounds, maybe more, and which makes English orthography so difficult. The advantage of Latin for scientific purposes is obvious. But this advantage is completely lost because scholars insist on pronouncing Latin names as if they were names in the language which they use for ordinary conversation. My Spanish friends pronounce scientific names as if they were Spanish words, my German friends pronounce them as if they were German. The Italian pronunciation of the ecclesiastical ritual is used by the Roman Catholic Church. The International Commission should make a ruling similar to the rulings made by the Spanish, French and Italian Academies, specifying how each letter and combination of letters should be pronounced, and the names should then be spelled phonetically.

In the case of names originating in Latin with Latin roots this will not necessitate any changes of orthography, but in those names originating in those languages which use diacritical marks it will make it necessary either to retain the diacritical marks or to alter the spelling to make its pronunciation phonetic. If the correct pronunciation of the names is one which cannot be spelled phonetically in Latin then it will be necessary either for the International Commission to suspend the rules by adopting the diacritical marks into Latin (which cannot always be done, as hereinabove explained) or by devising certain new combinations of letters to represent the sounds.

For instance, the letter " ll " in Spanish is not a single " l " repeated, but a different letter, with a different sound. It is the same sound that is represented by " gl " in Italian, and by " lh " in Portuguese. There is no good reason why names derived from these languages should be spelled etymologically. It would be far better to spell them phonetically, and in this case the " ll " of Spanish could be represented by " li " or " ly " in scientific Latin. If all the sounds of modern languages were tabulated and a corresponding spelling devised for their Latinization the problem of diacritical marks would vanish automatically. But it would take a scholar who was both a zoologist and a philologist. I know only one such person in this country. Certainly I could not do it myself, but I would be glad to try to help. This will be a long process but it can be done and should be done. First, the pronunciation of scientific Latin should be established, then the representation of words derived from foreign roots should be established on a phonetic basis.

The use of such names as *X-us* 10-*maculatus* are a convenience on manuscript labels, but they should not be authorized as an alternative form in publications. And this brings up another matter which the article in *Science* avoided. The International Commission has ruled that hyphenated names are not available in their entirety but that only the latter element may be used. Thus a species named after Milne-Edwards should be called *X-us edwardsi* and not *X-us milne-edwardsi*.

Does this establish a precedent for the name *X-us C-B-Adamsi* ? Personally I think it does. This species should be called *X-us adamsi*. And how about the names *X-us fredbakeri* or *X-us maxwellsmithi* ? I think these names could be allowed to stand because they are pronounceable. I would be opposed to such names as *X-us f-bakeri* or *X-us msmithi*.

The suggested new form of Article 20 is all right in so far as it is consistent with the views which I have expressed above. But much of it is inconsistent, as it allows for alternative forms of the same name, and also does away with diacritical marks without replacing them with something else. Both these Articles are defective in that they seem to assume that the printed letters on the page constitute the word. They do not. The word is the sound. No attempt should be made to legislate on the orthography until the pronunciation has been standardized.

DOCUMENT 5/8

By **JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr.** *(San Diego, California, U.S.A.)*

Extract from a letter dated 20th April, 1950

ON THE PRINCIPLES WHICH SHOULD GOVERN THE SPELLING OF NAMES

Some time ago I submitted an application which I have since withdrawn for the changing of the name " *Mangelia* " to " *Mangilia* " on the ground that this genus was named for Mangili. My authority for this statement was derived from comments made by later writers. When finally I was able to consult the original sources, I found that not only did the original author say nothing about the etymology of the name, but even the authority who devised the amended spelling gave no reason for doing so. The two forms had both been in use many years before anyone thought to explain them by bringing Mangili into the controversy. In addition, I have since learned that there was an investigator named Mangel, and that it is not impossible that this genus was named for him. Further, compounds of this name have since been published, among them *Clathromangelia* and *Typhlomangelia*, and to alter the spelling of the original name would imply an alteration of the derivatives as well. I now feel that the name should be retained in the form " *Mangelia* " and since that can be done without changing the rules or suspending them under plenary power, I make no application at present, though I suspect that this question may come up again later, as I think the genus is of sufficient importance to be placed on the *Official List*, and when that is done the Commission will probably wish to go into the matter of spelling.

As I said, the fact that I am probably the one who first raised this matter and have now changed my stand in regard to it makes it incumbent upon me to explain my present views. I am concerned here not with cases where the presence of an error can be detected from the original publication but with cases where the changes in spelling may be the deliberate intention of the original author. For instance, in the specific name *Polinices reclusiana* Deshayes, the trivial name was given in honour of Recluz, and the application of the principles enunciated in paragraph (*a*) would compel the spelling to be changed accordingly. During the latter part of the nineteenth century the spelling with the " Z " was more popular than that with the " S " but today popular taste seems to be in favour of the original spelling. In this instance the original spelling was not a typographical error as might be supposed but the deliberate intention of the proposer, who believed that the letter " Z " should be confined to words of Greek origin. Perhaps some members of the Commission will think that this is a bad rule, and it may be, but nevertheless it is a rule, and to restore the spelling with the " Z " would be in conflict with the intention of Deshayes.

I feel that in many instances it is wise to depart from the original spelling. The advantage of the Latin language, or at least one of them, is that it is nearly exactly phonetic, and should be kept so as far as possible in order to enable people of different languages to understand each other. Yet this advantage is quite completely ignored by almost everyone whom I know. My friends in Mexico and Cuba pronounce these words as if they were pronouncing Spanish names. I should think they would find this a great inconvenience since there are such wide divergencies in the way in which Spanish is spoken in Spain and in Latin America. There are even great differences in pronunciation between Mexico and Argentina. Another friend of mine, a displaced person from Vienna, tells me that there are two outstanding Universities in Austria which differ in the ways in which they pronounce classical languages. Another friend of mine with whom I discuss such questions, tells me that Oxford and Cambridge Universities use different systems of pronunciation. In this country we use three different ways of pronouncing Latin. The scientists pronounce them as if they were English words, the Roman Catholic Church pronounces them as if they were modern Italian words, and the preparatory schools use what they believe to have been the pronunciation used by educated Roman citizens of the Augustan period. I make no defence of any of these systems, but I feel that the practice of using different systems is indefensible, and that scientific people should agree on a common system and then stick to it.

A scientific name is not a group of symbols on a printed page, but a sound apprehended by the ear. The spelling of such a name should be that one which preserves the original pronunciation. When Linnaeus instituted his system of naming, nearly all names were Latin words, but since that time the practice of Latinizing names from other languages has been introduced. This was, of course, inevitable, and is not a bad thing. But when it is done, the spelling used should be capable of only one pronunciation and that should be the correct one.

For instance, in the Cyrillic alphabet there are three different sounds, all denoted by different characters, which in English transliterations are represented by one letter—Z. One of these has the sound of " Z " as in " Zebra ", one has the sound of the combination tz in the proper names " Fitz " and " Schwartz ", and one has the sound of the " Z " in " azure " or the " S " in " pleasure ". The famous Russian geneticist Dobzhansky, who now resides in the United States, represents the transliteration of this sound into English by " zh ", and it appears to me that, when foreign names from any language are transliterated into Latin, these combinations might well be used to represent these sounds, regardless of how the words were spelled in the original languages.

A similar situation exists with respect to the combination " Ch " in various European languages. The sound which it has in French is represented in English by Sh, and the sound which it has in Spanish is represented by " tsh ", though this combination is not used in English. The combination " Ch " in English as in " Church " is the same sound, but it is altogether different from the sound accorded this combination in German which is a fricatized guttural. In English we use the same combination in such words as " Chorus " where it has the sound of " K ". The reason that so many English letters have different sounds is, of course, that so many foreign languages have contributed to English, but that is no reason why English spelling should not be made phonetic. I am an advocate of simplifying the orthography of the English language, but I do not advocate it strenuously because I believe that it would get us nowhere to attempt it. English-speaking people are notoriously conservative, despite the various ways in which they pronounce the same word in different places. I have another friend who is an Englishman, who has prepared a list of words that are pronounced differently in this country from the way in which you pronounce them and it is a most interesting list.

I said above that " Ch " in German was a fricatized guttural. We do not have any fricatized gutturals in English, but we have fricatized labials and dentals which we spell in very inconsistent ways. We sometimes fricatize the letter " P " by adding " h " to it. This gives us the totally unnecessary duplication of the sound of " F ". In some fields of science the objection to such forced spelling is recognized, and the modern tendency to substitute the spelling " Sulfur " for the more archaic " Sulphur " is to be commended. My Spanish-speaking friends spell the name of the city where I was born like this—Filadelfia. I think that is an improvement. We spell all such words as come directly from Greek with " Ph ", but if such a word is introduced into English indirectly through Russian, we spell it with an " F ". There is no reason that I can see for not spelling this sound in all scientific works with " F ". And in this connection, note that we do not fricatize " B " in this way. The fricatized " B " is always represented in English by " V ", except in a few words (and I am not even sure of this) from Sanscrit. We also use the " H " to fricatize " T ", but we are quite inconsistent in using the combination " Th " to represent not only the fricatization of " T " but also of " D ". The sound of " Th " in " There " should be spelled " Dh ".

One might go on indefinitely in this way. One might speak of the many cases in which French words end with a silent letter. Such a letter, I believe, should always be omitted in Latinizations of French words. In English we have many silent letters also. I was recently shocked by coming across a Latinized English name *Wrightudora*. This is a subgenus of *Tudora* named in honour of a man named Wright. Now the name Wright is a particularly good example of the futility of attempting to preserve the orthography of foreign words in Latin transliterations. Of its six letters, three are silent, and the vowel represents a diphthong. It would have been much better if the three silent letters had been omitted and the vowel replaced by two vowels. The name would then have been *Raitudora* in mediaeval Latin or *Raetudora* in classical Latin. It may be said that no one would recognize the name Wright in the phonetic spellings " Rait " or " Raet ", but then neither would one recognize it if one heard it pronounced phonetically by a German or by a Scotchman. The spelling of the Latinization should not conform to the original spelling but should give a pronunciation that conforms with the original pronunciation. In the case of barbaric languages which have sounds that are so difficult of pronunciation that they cannot be pronounced accurately by those of the white race, this rule would have to be somewhat relaxed, but in such cases there is likely not to be an alphabet, or at least not a Latin alphabet, so that the names would have to be transliterated anyhow, and the possibility of retaining the original spelling would not arise.

I would like to request therefore, that for the present no ruling be laid down, but that attention should be called to the need of a ruling. Then an attempt should be made to provide a schedule for the transliteration of all sounds in modern European languages into Scientific Latin. This would be a great task but one that is urgently needed. I must confess that I know of no one in this country that is competent to prepare such a schedule, but you have in England one man who is eminently qualified—I refer of course, to Professor Needham, who is a student of philology and linguistics as well as of zoology. Also a few years ago you had another in Scotland—Dr. D'Arcy W. Thompson, who could have done it.

When such a schedule is prepared, it may be found that the English alphabet does not supply a sufficient number of combinations of letters to represent all the sounds. If this is the case, some of the sounds might be arbitrarily suppressed, and represented by other sounds as nearly like them as possible. Or diacritical marks could be resorted to. This must be done with caution, however, as the same diacritical marks may be used in different languages to mean different things. For instance, the two dots placed over a vowel may be a diaeresis or an umlaut. And the diaeresis in Latin means a very different thing from what it does in Spanish, and the umlaut in German means a very different thing from what it does in Danish, so that this symbol has at least four different meanings.

Please pardon me for writing such a voluminous letter. It is submitted for serious consideration of your Commission.

DOCUMENT 5/9

By **JOHN T. ZIMMER** (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

Letter dated 28th February, 1951

I have seen your recent call for expressions of opinion regarding Article 19 of the International Code. I may say that I am opposed to wholesale emendations based on a subsequent author's concept of what the original author should have done. This includes some of the action at the Paris Congress where emendations are authorized under several circumstances that open the way to differences of opinion and may lead to a series of emendations such as were made in early years of taxonomy. Synonymy is stuffed with changes in spelling because someone or other thought words were not strictly classical or were otherwise mis-spelled when, for all they could prove, the original author may have known that his spelling was different from that used by others but preferred it that way.

I am willing to admit emendation when the classical or vernacular origin of a name is stated in the original account or where the person or place is similarly noted, but the emendation should not be allowed to attempt to modernize names or change spelling beyond the point necessary to agree with the author's spelling of the base name. If the author does not give the source of the name, it should remain as he spelled it, however obviously wrong, until the Commission can rule on it. An exception is where a mis-spelled name is repeated elsewhere in the text or index or on an accompanying plate in the correct spelling. Consistent mis-spelling of adopted names and their antecedents should go to the Commission, not be emended by any or everyone.

(1) *Lacerta Stincus* Linnaeus may be emended to *scincus*, a name cited in synonymy.
(2) *Lipangus* Boie, emended to *Lipaugus*; origin given by Boie as λιπαυγος.
(3) *Hirundo acquitorialis* should be *aequatorialis*; said to be from Ecuador.
(4) *Camptostoma obsoletum maronica* should be *maranonica* as elsewhere in the text.
(5) *Mimus columbianus* is not to be changed to *colombianus*; noted as from "Columbia."
(6) *Motacilla Pensylvanica not* to be *pennsylvanica*; cited as from "Pensylvania".
(7) *Coeligena Warszewizii not* to be *warszewiczii*; collector given as Warszewiz.
(8) *Myiarchus bahiae not* to be *baiae* as the modern locality name would suggest.
(9) *Tringa Ochrophus* obviously an error for *ochropus* although *Ochrophus* is cited in synonymy, also erroneously; Commission action necessary.*

The only safe plan, I believe, is to maintain original spellings unless a true lapsus is demonstrable from the original account. In all other cases, demand Commission action.

---

* See application on this subject by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **9**: 52.)

DOCUMENT 5/10

By **CESARE EMILIANI** (*University of Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

Statement received on 4th April, 1951

PROBLEMS OF GRAMMAR AND NOMENCLATURE

I.—Introduction

Today, more than ever before, a student of the biological sciences finds it difficult to follow both nomenclatural and grammatical rules. Increasing disregard for the classical languages, particularly in the United States, Russia and the Orient, is largely responsible.

2. Taxonomic rules state in essence that:
    (1) Nomenclature must use the Latin language.
    (2) An organism is known by a generic and a specific name (possibly also a subgeneric and a subspecific name).
    (3) These names may be natural or artificial words.
    (4) Generic names must be used as substantives.
    (5) Specific adjectives (and presumably participles and pronouns) must conform in gender to the generic name to which they are attached.

3. Three main problems originate from these rules:
    (1) Substantives; adjectives, participles, and pronouns; other parts of speech; and artificial words, must be distinguished.
    (2) Gender of generic names must be determined.
    (3) Specific adjectives, participles, and pronouns must be given the proper gender ending.

4. Several authors in recent years have proposed different solutions to these problems. McAtee (1929) suggested that " generic and subordinate names . . . shall be regarded . . . as arbitrary combinations of letters " and therefore, except for proved typographical errors, remain as the first author used them, Guba and Linder (1932) proposed to keep unchanged the original spellings even if erroneous. Blackwelder (1941) repeated suggestions previously made by Carsey (1890) for determining the gender of generic names by their endings, and published lists of endings for these determinations. Richter recommended that all specific substantives with *-us* (or *-er*), *-a* and *-um* endings, and all specific adjectives, should be used in the feminine form (Richter, 1942; Weller, 1950; Bartenstein, 1950).

5. Other authors have made occasional reference to these problems, often publishing partly incorrect statements. Thus Baker (1929) reported that *Zonitoides* should be masculine ; Macfadyen and Kenny (1934) and Thalmann (1950) classified as masculine all names ending in *-ides*, *-ites*, and *-oides ;* and Bartenstein (1950) concluded that endings in *-ites*, *-on*, and *-opsis* indicate the masculine.

6. Some of the suggestions that have been made (McAtee, 1929 ; Guba and Linder, 1932), if accepted, would increase the difficulties of nomenclature, because both specific names and their particular endings would have to be remembered. Blackwelder's lists are very treacherous, because there are exceptions to all such generalities. Richter has not solved these problems either because substantives, adjectives, participles, and pronouns must still be identified and proper handling of the feminine form is required. Also his suggestion that all substantives with endings in *-us* (or *-er*), *-a* and *-um* be used in the feminine form, if applied to words that are exclusively substantives, would be likely to create new names and thus add to the confusion.

7. All the foregoing suggestions aim at avoiding the difficulties of Latin grammar. It is the opinion of the writer that, if the Latin language is used, it is impossible to ignore its rules ; and that a strict observance of these rules is really not so difficult and offers the most convenient solution to the whole problem.

8. Students are inclined to spend much time checking earlier authors to resolve nomenclatorial doubts. A quicker and safer course is to consult good Latin and Greek dictionaries. Some of the best are : *Forcellini : Totius Latinitatis Lexicon ; De-Vit : Totius Latinitatis Onomasticon ; Estennes : Thesaurus Graecae Linguae.* A rational use of dictionaries and the few suggestions that follow, will help to solve most controversial issues definitely. The exceptions that may occur, do not impair the procedure.

II.—Generic Names

A—If generic name is a substantive

(1) Simple or compounds substantives.

ex : *Arca*, *Asperitas*, *Aulocaulis*, *Battus*, *Chiton*, *Cyphosoma*, *Dictyonema*, *Homotrema*, *Lagena*, *Murex*, *Orthoceras*, *Tetrataxis*, *Venus*. Gender may be determined from dictionaries. Only the last parts of compound names need to be considered.

(2) **Simple or compound substantives with diminutive suffixes -lus, -a, um ; -ulus, -a, -um ; -culus, -a, -um ; -unculus, -a, -um ; -inus, -a, -um ; -ellus, -a, -um ; -illus, -a, -um ; -olus -a, -um.** Ex. : *Atrypina*, *Atrypella*, *Avicula*, *Modiolus*, *Pectunculus*, *Scutella*, *Vulvulina*, *Asanoina*, *Cushmanella*, *Haeckelina*, *Paalzowella*, *Schubertella*, *Wiesnerella*. Gender is determined by endings. Many words having these endings are not diminutive forms, and dictionaries should be consulted in all cases of doubt. Barbaric names (*Asanoina*, *Cushmanella*, *Haeckelina*, etc.) should be easily recognizable.

B—If generic name is a substantivized adjective or participle

(1) **Simple or compound adjectives or participles with three endings** (in Latin mostly *-us* or *-er*, m. ; *-a*, f. ; *-um*, n. ; in Greek mostly -ος, m. ; -η, f. ; -ον, n.). Ex.: *Ammospirata*, *Arctica*, *Blainvillea*, *Bronteus*, *Carpenteria*, *Composita*, *Entosolenia*, *Flintia*, *Indiana*, *Metagraulos*, *Michelinia*, *Valvata*, *Viviparus*. Gender is determined by ending.

(2) **Simple or compound adjectives with two endings** (in Latin *-is*, m. and f. ; -e, n. ; in Greek -ος, -ων, -ως, -ης, -ις, -υς, m. and f. ; -ον, -ων, -ες, -ι, -υ, n. Ex. : *Daiphron*, *Epelys*, *Monoceros*, *Vorticialis*. These names have one ending for masculine and feminine, and another for neuter. Note that since the Greek endings -ον, -ων, and -ης, -ες, are transliterated into Latin simply as *-on*, and *-es*, transliterated names of this type do not indicate any particular gender. Greek adjectives with two endings, -ος, m. and f., and -ου, n., assume three endings in Latin. Ex. : ἀυαλογος, -ου, becomes *analogous*, *a*, *um* ; βαρβαρος, -ου, becomes *barbarus*, *a*, *um*.

(3) **Simple or compound adjectives and participles with one ending** (various types).

a. Names that may be indifferently masculine, feminine, or neuter. Ex. ; *Anomalinoides*, *Trochamminoides*, most classical and all post-classical names with the same ending. The adjectival character of these names is evident. The Latin ending *-oides* derives from the Greek neuter word τὸ εἶδος, meaning " image, shape ". Greek compounds with εἶδος are usually adjectives with two endings (ἀεροειδής, ες; σησαμοειδης, ες. Some of these names were substantivized as neuter nouns (τὸ σφαιροειδές). Latin equivalents are usually adjectives with one ending (*rhythmoides*). Very rarely Latin names of this type were substantivized, either as masculine (*aeroides*, *ae*), feminine (*sphaeroides*, *is*), or neuter (*sesamoides*, *is*).

b. Names that may be only masculine or feminine. Ex. : *Apus*, *Harpax*, *Monyx*, *Calliops*, *Ogygopsis*, most classical and all post-classical names in *-ops* and *-opsis* derived from the Greek words ὄψ, ὤψ, and ὄψις. Many of these names are compounds ending with a substantive. Names derived from ὄψ, ὤψ, and ὄψις need special consideration, because a very great number of post-classical names of this type are used in nomenclature. Their adjectival character should be obvious. The words ἡ ὄψ (" eye, face " ; also " voice ") and ἡ (sometimes ὁ) ὤψ (" eye, face ") are used as endings for a large number of Greek adjectives bearing the idea of " look, appearance " (αἴδοψ, fiery looking ; ἀλαώψ, blind-eyed ; μήλοψ, looking like an apple ; μονώψ, one-eyed ; φαινοψ, bright-eyed ; φλογώψ, fiery looking ; Χάροψ glad-eyed). Very rarely these have been substantivized (Κύκλωψ, Cyclops). Latin equivalents may be adjectives (*myops*) or substantives of masculine (*Cyclops*) or feminine (*Cynops*) gender. Also the Greek word ἡ ὄψις (" look, appearance ") has been used as an ending for a number of compound adjectives (μακαρόψις, with a long face ; φακόψις with freckles on the face). If substantives, names of this type are feminine both in Greek and Latin (ἡ διόψις, ἡ συνοψις ; *synopsis*). Many Greek names ending in -οψ, -ωψ, or -οψις, and their Latin correspondents are not related to the words ὄψ, ὤψ, or ὄψις, but have different etymologies and genders. Use of dictionaries is necessary to distinguish them.

C. Adjectives that may be of only one gender. Ex. : *Gennadas* (masculine) ; *Hyalopsis*, *Monopis* (feminine).

Names of types 2 and 3 have caused the greatest confusion in nomenclature, because their genders are very often indeterminate. It would be most helpful if these were established by convention. This can be done easily if these names are thought of as referring to the word *forma* (or *concha* for shelled animals). Thus their genders would be established as feminine. Names that may be either substantives or adjectives (*Tribon*) should be interpreted as substantives, to agree with the substantival character of the generic name.

C—If generic name is another part of speech

(1) Pronouns. Ex.: *Mea, Quisque, Utra.* Most pronouns have different forms for different genders.

(2) Verbs, participles excepted, and other parts of speech. Ex.: *Extra, Parce.* All these names should be considered neuter.

D—If generic name is an artificial word

(1) Artificial combinations of letters. Ex.: *Aa, Neda, Nonion, Salifa, Torix.*

(2) Barbaric unlatinized names. Ex.: *Macao, Scalez, Vanikoro.*

(3) Names with mis-spelled endings. Ex.: *Batocriusis* (for *Batocrinon, Graphiadactyllis* (for *Graphiadactylus*).

The genders of these names could be established as masculine or neuter in case of obvious masculine or neuter endings. All others, including the barbaric names, could be considered feminine by analogy with the suggestion in paragraph II, B, 3.

III—Specific Names

A—If specific name is a substantive

Specific substantives may be either in the nominative singular in apposition to the generic name (*Retepora archimedes*), or in the genitive, as a possessive term (*Rotalia beccarii*).

B—If specific name is an adjective or participle

The gender of a specific adjective or participle must conform with the gender of the generic name.

Latin compound adjectives whose last parts are substantives, are regularly inflected like adjectives with three endings if they end in *-us* (or *-er*), *-a*, or *-um*, or as adjectives with two endings if they end in *-is* or *-e* (cfr. *semicirculus, -a, -um*; *sexangulus, -a, -um*; *unicalamus, -a, -um*; *unimanus, -a, -um*; *semicanis, -e*; etc.).

Names that may be either substantives or adjectives should be considered as adjectives to agree with the adjectival character of the specific name.

C—If specific name is another part of speech

1. Pronouns. Pronouns that have different forms for different genders should follow accordance rules (*Spondylospira alia*).

2. Verbs, participles excluded, and other parts of speech. All these names should be considered invariably as appositions.

D—If specific name is an artificial word

Artificial names similar to those used for generic names have been employed for species. They should be treated invariably as appositions.

IV—Limitations

Some possibilities of error and doubt remain :

(1) Mis-spelled names and failure to recognize barbaric and artificial words as such may lead to wrong identifications in the dictionaries.

(2) Greek verbal forms other than the infinitive may not be found in the dictionaries (*Dendryazousa*).

(3) The same word may be found to have different values and meanings. As suggested, names that may be either substantives or adjectives should be considered substantives, if used as generic names, or adjectives, if used as specific names. Other names may be either substantives or adverbs (*Parum*), pronouns or adverbs (*Alia*), verbs or adverbs (*Parce*), etc. No rule can be set for these names, and each must be considered individually. They occur very rarely.

DOCUMENT 5/11

By the late **JAMES L. PETERS**

(*Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*)

Extract from a letter, dated 21st May, 1951

RELATIVE STATUS FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE LAW OF HOMONYMY OF SCIENTIFIC NAMES CONSISTING OF COMPOUND WORDS DIFFERING FROM ONE ANOTHER IN SPELLING ONLY BY THE USE OF DIFFERENT CONNECTIVE VOWELS

Another question in my mind is the status as homonyms of such compound names as *albofasciatus*, *albifasciatus*, etc. Here Sherborn treats such compounds as different names, and under the Rules they are, even though of the same origin and meaning.

DOCUMENT 5/12

By W. D. LANG

(late of *British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Department of Geology*, *London*)

Letter, dated 12th June, 1951

It is only recently that I have seen your letter in *Nature* (vol. **167** : 160) on the Orthography of Names in Zoology, asking for the opinions of zoologists and palaeontologists on the matter.

I have always advocated a very wide interpretation of Article 19, and, if a name derived from Greek or Latin is wrongly formed, have held it not only kinder to the author, but also to be an opportunity of purifying our nomenclature, to attribute the mis-spelling to a printer's error and not to the author's ignorance.

A caveat, however, should be entered. If an author does not state the derivation of a name, it can easily be wrongly assumed that he derived the name from this or that classical word or words, while really he derived it from another source. It follows that, in putting forward a new name, the author should give its derivation (if any) and this should be made compulsory.

I plead guilty freely to have emended generic names derived from classical words (taking my co-authors with me) in our work—W. D. Lang, Stanley Smith, and H. D. Thomas in our *Index of Palaeozoic Coral Genera* (Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.)), in which, incidentally, I have described the Code as " imperfectly conceived and inadequately expressed " (p. 8). This was not meant unkindly, but as expressing the struggles and difficulties of interpreting it over a professional lifetime.

DOCUMENT 5/13

By **J. MARVIN WELLER**

(*University of Chicago, Department of Geology, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

Enclosure to a letter, dated 26th November, 1951

VARIATIONS IN SPELLING OF HOMONYMOUS NAMES

The International Rules list certain variations in the spelling of specific names, mostly resulting from variant transliterations from the Greek, which are not sufficient to prevent the formation of homonyms (Art. 35, a to e). Presumably this list is exhaustive and at present any other variations in spelling serve to distinguish different names from each other.

Obviously, similar provisions should apply to generic names.*

A logical review of this general problem suggests that a broadening of the rule is desirable and the International Commission is requested to consider emending and adding to this list as follows:

(1) All variations resulting from non-uniform phonetic transliterations of names or words derived from languages normally not written in the Roman alphabet. Examples: *Shantungia* Walcott, 1905, and *Schantungia* Lorenz, 1906, Trilobita (from Chinese), *Jacobsonia* Koschantschikov, 1912, and *Yakobsonia* Kozancikov, 1912, Coleoptera (from Russian).

(2) Variations resulting from the phonetic representation of certain consonants of some languages whose pronunciation differs from that of French. Example: *Kuzmićia* Brusina, 1870, and *Kuzmichia* Norman, 1890, Mollusca.

(3) The presence or absence of an umlaut, or similar sign, or the equivalent double vowel. Examples: *Törnquistia* Reed, 1896, *Toernquistia* Vogdes, 1925, and *Tornquistia* Kobayashi, 1935, Trilobita.

(4) The presence or absence of accents or other diacritic marks. Examples: *Légeria* Labbé, 1899, and *Legeria* Blanchard, 1900, Protozoa; *Ichthyaetus* Kaup, 1829 and *Ichthyaëtus* Sweeting, 1837, Aves.

---

* *Ed. Note:* Since 1948 these rules have applied to generic names (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 161–162).

(5) The presence or absence of *i* used as a connective vowel between the parts of compound names or before gender or other suffixes. Examples : *Brachonyx* Schoenherr, 1825, and *Brachionyx* Meigen, 1832, Coleoptera and Lepidoptera ; *Bayleia* Munier-Chalmas, 1873, and *Baylea* Koninck 1883, Mollusca.

(6) Variations in connective vowels of compound names or elimination or alteration of initial or terminal root vowels for euphonistic purposes. Examples : *Aviculopecten* M'Coy, 1851, and *Aveculipecten* Girty, 1904, Mollusca ; *Heterechinus* Quenstedt, 1874, and *Heteroechinus* Quenstedt, 1874, Echinodermata ; *Pseudoophonus* Metschouslky, 1844, *Pseudophonus* Motschoulsky, 1848, and *Pseudaphonus* Casey, 1915, Coleoptera ; *Lahillia* Cossmann, 1899, and *Lahillea* Loriol, 1904, Mollusca and Echinodermata.

In the interest of clarity and to eliminate the possibility of confusion, other slight variations of spelling within restricted zoologic groups are undesirable. No rules can be framed to meet this situation, however, because the International Rules are not concerned with taxonomic matters and disagreement is likely to occur concerning degrees of supposed relationship. Nevertheless, the International Commission should indicate its interest in problems of this type and its willingness to consider petitions for the exercise of its plenary powers in the suppression of junior or less used names if confusion is indicated.

(*a*) Most troublesome are names differing only in gender ending. Example : *Strotocephalus* Resser, 1935, and *Strotocephala* Raymond, 1937, Trilobita.

(*b*) Some names differing in gender endings also differ slightly in other ways. Examples : *Pterocephalia* Roemer, 1852, and *Pterocephalus* Raw, 1908, Trilobita ; *Ellipsocephalus* Emmrich, 1839, (common spelling of *Elleipsocephalus* Zenker, 1838), and *Elliptocephala* Emmons, 1844, Trilobita.

(*c*) Other names that might be confused differ slightly in a great variety of ways. Examples : *Chuangia* Walcott, 1911, and *Changia* Sun, 1923, Trilobita ; *Shangtungia* Walcott, 1905, and *Schantungia* Lorenz, 1906, Trilobita.

DOCUMENT 5/14

By **G. H. E. HOPKINS**, O.B.E., M.A.

(*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts.*)

Statement received on 14th March, 1952

ON THE REFORM OF ARTICLE 19 OF THE " RÈGLES " RELATING TO THE CONDITIONS IN WHICH EMENDATIONS OF SCIENTIFIC NAMES SHOULD BE MADE OR ACCEPTED

In para. 17 of the request for advice on the subject of emendation of zoological names *(Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 4–49), proposals are made for the definition of " emendation " and " erroneous spelling change ", and the suggestion is made that there is not likely to be any difficulty in finding an author who, in making an emendation, definitely states that the original spelling was wrong. In my opinion the definition of " emendation " is too rigid, unless a third category is added to the two categories of spelling-alterations which it is proposed to define, and it is not a matter of opinion but of subjective fact that the suggestion that it will not be difficult to find some author who makes the statement that the original spelling was wrong is too optimistic. I am able to produce a definite instance that illustrates these points.

Kellogg and Chapman (1902, *J. N. Y. ent. Soc.* **10**) describe a species of Mallophaga whose name is spelt on p. 21 as *Nirmus luprepes* and on p. 28 as *Nirmus luprepea.* Kellogg never gave names consisting of arbitrary arrangements of letters, and this name ought quite obviously to be *euprepes* (from εὐπρεπης, well-looking, or comely) for *luprepes* is meaningless either in Latin or in Greek. Moreover, Kellogg himself (1908, Wytsman's *Genera Insectorum* fascicle **66**, *Mallophaga* : 24 and 79) corrected the spelling to *euprepes* but without making any statement that the original spelling was wrong. Apart from the fact that two new spelling-mistakes were made by Kellogg and Chapman in 1912 (*Ent. News* **23** : 13, where the name is misspelt *Normis eaprepes*), and that one author on one occasion reverted to *luprepes* (as the earliest spelling), all subsequent authors have spelt the trivial component of the specific name as *euprepes* until Hopkins (1942, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (11) **9** : 113, 114) pointed out that *Nirmus cuprepes* Kellogg and Chapman 1902 is a subjective synonym of *Quadraceps strepsilaris* (Denny) 1842, but no author (to the best of my knowledge) has ever published a definite statement that the spelling " *luprepes* " was wrong. The fact that *euprepes* is a synonym does not affect the argument, and in this instance the fact that no author has ever made it clear that he was making the spelling-change intentionally would mean, under the proposed definitions, that we would have to reject Kellogg's almost universally accepted and obviously correct emendation of 1908 as either " an error " or " an erroneous spelling change " and revert to the misprint " *luprepes* ".

To a considerable extent the difficulty is met by the " saving clause " suggested in para. **21** of the request for advice, but the objection to calling a correction an " erroneous spelling change " in cases where the change is clearly correct remains unaffected. I suggest that the addition of a category which might be called an " apparent correction ", a " non-explicit emendation " or a " potentially valid alteration " for those instances in which there is reason to believe that the alteration may have been deliberate although this is not actually stated would do less violence to the facts, be less objectionable, and be less liable to be read as prejudging the case, than to attempt to force such instances into the Procrustean alternatives of " emendation " or " erroneous spelling change ". I, for one, could never bring myself to stigmatise as either " an error " or " an erroneous spelling change " Kellogg's obviously correct emendation of " *luprepes* " to " *euprepes* " without at least explaining that a too-rigid definition forced me to use a misleading and incorrect term merely because Kellogg did not actually state that the correction was deliberate.

Moreover, the proposed " saving clause " does not meet the requirements of another class of error in which the emendation has not yet been published. Again, I am able to illustrate this by a definite example. Ioff (1930, *Zool. Anz.* **92** : 201) named a flea *Xenopsylla nuttali*, stating (*l.c.* : 204) that it was named in honour of Professor G. D. H. " Nuttal ", the well-known English parasitologist. None of the few writers who have had occasion to refer to the species since its description have been English-speaking, and evidently none of them were aware that the Professor's name was Nuttall, for no correction has been published, so the incorrect spelling " *nuttali* " is the one in current use and the " saving clause " does not authorise its automatic correction to *nuttalli*. Nor does any other paragraph of the suggestions appear to cover this type of instance. Para. **39** deals only with automatic emendation of names incorrectly transliterated from some alphabet other than Latin, and para. **40** with spelling mistakes in names of personages of Roman antiquity, while para. **43** deals (so far as names derived from those of persons are concerned) only with errors in reading or copying the name of the captor of a specimen. *Xenopsylla* " *nuttali* " falls into none of these classes, yet to many parasitologists the perpetuation of this mis-spelling of the name of our late eminent colleague is far more objectionable than the perpetuation of " *Vennus* " for *Venus* or " *Cesar* " for *Caesar* (see para. **40** of the request for advice), since those latter personages, eminent though they were, are not our own living or recently deceased fellow-workers in zoology. The difficulty could be met by substituting in para. **45** for the words " captor of a specimen " the phrase " person upon who name the name of the taxonomic unit is based " (a change that in any case is desirable) but for the fact that this paragraph does not provide for automatic correction of the mistake, as is obviously desirable where the correction is based on an objective fact like the spelling of a name normally written in the Latin alphabet. There seems to be no reason, however, why the names of modern persons (if normally written in the Latin alphabet) should be excluded from the provision for automatic correction made in para. **40**, and in my opinion this should be done. It may be asserted that it is so obvious that an error of this kind contravenes Article 14 that it is unnecessary to state that the error should automatically be corrected, but arguments with other systematists have convinced us that it is unsafe to leave even the most obvious deduction to the commonsense of the reader, and that every detail (so far as possible) should be explicitly dealt with in the *Règles*.

DOCUMENT 5/15

By **C. W. WRIGHT** (*London*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 19th March, 1952

THE EMENDATION OF ZOOLOGICAL NAMES (Z.N.(S.)356)

In accordance with the request in the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature, 7, Parts 1 and 2, 25th February, 1952, I give my views on the conclusions and recommendations relating to the above subject.

2. I write as a palaeozoologist trained and interested in the classical languages. Despite this background I strongly endorse the objects and methods of the proposals. In particular I agree to the need to restrict the scope of automatic emendation. In the past many emendations have been made by authors quite unqualified to do so even on the basis of the principles which they supposed that they were employing. This source of confusion will be reduced as the scope of automatic emendation is reduced.

3. As in other fields however, the provisions for emendation by the International Commission will only be generally acceptable to the extent that applications and, more important, decisions appear rapidly in the *Bulletin* and to the extent that the *Bulletin* is read by an adequate number of zoologists.

4. With regard to the suggested provisions to be inserted in the *Règles* concurrently with the Law of Emendation, I support the suggested solution to the problem of two or more spellings of a name employed in the original publication. I also agree that it is necessary to insert an Article prescribing the procedure to be followed in forming adjectival names based upon place names. A case that should be taken into consideration when this Article is drafted is that of the abbreviation of the original name : for example Brydone (1929 : passim) in several instances employed trivial names of the form " *trimensis* " based on place names such as Trimingham.

5. Reference was made in para. 54 to the decision of the International Congress in 1948 that personal names employed in a Latinised genitive as trivial names should where published originally with the termination " *ii* " be automatically emended to end in " *i* ". I suggest that when the appropriate Article comes to be rewritten specific reference should be made to the necessity for preserving and *not* " emending " adjectival trivial names formed from personal names and ending in " *anus* "*. In the past and especially in the mid-nineteenth century these trivial names have in many cases been " emended " to end in " *i* ".

Reference

Brydone, R. M., 1929. " Further notes on new or imperfectly known Polyzoa," London.

---

* In this connection see Document 14/1 (: 221).

DOCUMENT 5/16

By **RUDOLF RICHTER**

(*Forschungs-Institut, Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*)

Statement received on 28th March, 1952

(**Editorial Note :** The following paper by Professor Richter had, prior to its submission to the International Commission, been published (in February 1952) in the serial publication *Senckenbergiana* (**32**(5/6) : 357–366) and the copy submitted was an offprint from that serial. A large part of this paper was concerned with the use in zoological names of diacritic marks, and many examples in various types of fount were given by Professor Richter. On inspection of this paper it was considered that, in view of the importance to Professor Richter's argument of the correct reproduction of the numerous diacritic marks which he cited and of the difficulty (as he pointed out) in printing these signs, the best course would be to reproduce his paper by facsimile rather than to reprint it. This course has accordingly been followed.)

English Translation of the Summary of Conclusions given by Professor Richter on the last page of his paper

The revised text of the *Règles* should announce unmistakably the principle : " Quo modo impressum est, nomen maneat." A zoological name may not be privately emended. Even " la recherche du parrain [geneological research] est interdite ", if it leads to the changing of zoological names.

Diacritic marks are nomenclatorially non-significant and create only optional variations of the same name. The limitation of printing technique leaves no alternative.

The difference between " Umlaut " and " Laut " is nomenclatorially significant (" ue " is nomenclatorially distinct from " u ", but " ue " is nomenclatorially identical with " ü "). Since in German the " Umlaut " can always be expressed in the Latin alphabet (as " ue ") as well as by the use of diacritic marks (" ü "), the classical form should be permitted in reproducing names originally published with an " Umlaut " and should be compulsory for all new names to be published in future. Here, too, limitations of printing technique allow no choice.

The emendation of a zoological name is nomenclatorially valid only in those important individual cases where the Commission has exercised its plenary powers to " Suspend the Rules ".

Senckenbergiana	Band 32	Nummer 5/6	Seite 357–366	Frankfurt am Main, 20. 2. 1952

Antworten und Fragen zur Zoologischen Nomenklatur. 1.

Schutz der Tier-Namen vor Emendation.

(Veränderung der Schreibweise infolge von Diakritischen Zeichen, Umlaut und Transkription.)

Rudolf Richter,
Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg.

Inhalt:

Vorwort 357
A. Stabilisierung durch den Satz „Quo modo impressum est, nomen maneat“ 358
B. Diakritische Zeichen oder Klassisches Latein-Alphabet? 358
C. Umlaute dürfen von der Nomenklatur nicht mit Diakritischen Zeichen verwechselt werden 360
D. Schutz vor Einflüssen der Transkription 362
E. Schutz vor Einflüssen der Schreibweise des Paten-Namens 364
Ergebnisse 365
Schriften-Verzeichnis 366

Vorwort.

Wie sich der Chirurg der Sorge um sein Werkzeug nicht entziehen darf, so gibt es für den Zoologen, den neontologischen wie den paläontologischen, in der Nomenklatur kein „minima non curat praetor“. Überläßt er eine Winzigkeit dem Nomenklaturisten, so bleibt die Nomenklatur in Unruhe, und die Beschäftigung mit ihr wird als Selbstzweck verewigt.

Die Nomenklatur hat jedem Namen eine Form zu geben, die in allen Sprachen und zu allen Zeiten unveränderlich bleibt. Sie hat zweitens die Eindeutigkeit zu sichern, indem sie jeden Namen an eine Urkunde bindet und seine Legitimität von der kenntlichen Veröffentlichung dieser Urkunde abhängig macht.

Die Internationalen Kongresse haben zu diesem Zweck die „Internationalen Regeln der Zoologischen Nomenklatur“ (IRZN) geschaffen und die „Ständige Kommission“ eingesetzt, die durch ihre „Gutachten“ (opinions) die Entwicklung der Nomenklatur weiterführen soll. Diese Entwicklung zur Stabilität hat sich anfangs zögernd und erst nach der Einführung der „Suspension“ etwas rascher vollzogen. Von der Beschäftigung mit einzelnen, oft nur für Spezialisten wichtigen Namen beginnt sich die Kommission erst neuerdings dem durchgreifenden Schutz aller gebräuchlichen Namen zuzuwenden.

Die Entwicklung ist auf dem Marsch. Ihr gelten auch diese „Antworten“. Es werden häufig Fragen an uns gerichtet. Und wenn dann die Antwort nicht durch einen Hinweis auf die IRZN oder auf die betreffende Stelle in unsrer „Einführung“ (1948, 2. Aufl.) gegeben werden kann, sondern von grundsätzlichem Interesse ist, so soll sie hier gegeben werden. Gelegentlich möchten aber auch wir „Fragen“ aufwerfen, die wir im Sinne der Entwicklung zur Stabilität geklärt sehen möchten. Der Internationale Zoologen-Kongreß soll ja 1953 in Kopenhagen über eine neue Fassung der IRZN Beschluß fassen, mit deren Entwurf er die Kommission beauftragt hat. Da dabei auch an die inhaltliche Änderung einiger Bestimmungen gedacht wird, muß die Öffentlichkeit rechtzeitig zur Mitwirkung herangezogen werden.

A. Stabilisierung durch den Satz „Quo modo impressum est, nomen maneat".

Es handelt sich hier nicht um die Frage nach der sprachlichen „Richtigkeit" des Namens. Es handelt sich um die Sicherheit der Nomenklatur.

In ihren Anfängen stand die Nomenklatur unter der Furcht vor einer, von der Schule her, als engherzig verkannten Philologie. Gerade die wissenschaftliche Philologie aber hat, über manche vermeintliche Schwierigkeit hinweg, bei der Stabilisierung der Namen geholfen, indem sie schöpferische Möglichkeiten zeigte, die schon in den Entwicklungs-Gesetzen der alten Sprachen liegen. Die Kommission, in der wachsenden Erkenntnis ihrer stabilisierenden Aufgabe, hat das dankbar begrüßt.

Sorgfältige Rücksicht auch auf die sprachliche Richtigkeit soll bei der Aufstellung eines Namens ernste Pflicht sein, nicht nur für jeden überzeugten Humanisten.

Aber es ist der oberste Grundsatz der Nomenklatur: Unzoologische Erwägungen dürfen die Stabilität der Nomenklatur nicht gefährden. Auch aus philologischen und historischen Erwägungen darf ein veröffentlichter Name nicht geändert werden.

Seitdem die Kommission einmal zur Beurteilung eines Tier-Namens Sachverständige des kretischen, megarischen und syrakusanischen Dialekts des Griechischen heranziehen sollte (R. R. 1948: 123), hat man eingesehen, daß solche Erörterungen selten zu einer einheitlichen Entscheidung führen und daß die zoologische Wissenschaft andere Aufgaben hat. Das Werkzeug Nomenklatur soll scharf bleiben; das ist alles.

Quo modo impressum est, nomen maneat. Die Erkenntnis dieser Notwendigkeit verhindert, daß durch Nomenklaturisten Sand in die empfindliche Maschine der Nomenklatur gestreut wird. Zum Schutz der Namen gegen unzoologische Änderungen liegen in den „Regeln" und „Gutachten" Stabilisatoren für den Einsichtigen bereit. Als ultima ratio hat die Kommission den Artikel 24k der IRZN selber herangezogen und damit zum Gebrauch empfohlen: Als „willkürliche Vereinigung von Buchstaben" kann schließlich fast jeder Name vor Besserwisserei geschützt werden. (Dieser Schutz wird lückenlos sobald in Artikel 34 u. 35 die 5 Worte „von derselben Ableitung und Bedeutung" gestrichen werden: vgl. F.)

Überlegungen und Anträge, wie sie soeben (1951a, b) von H. M. MUIR-WOOD veröffentlicht werden, sind zur Klärung solcher Fragen willkommen. Es scheint uns allerdings, als ob diese Anträge bereits von den IRZN entschieden sind, sobald man diese, ihrem Geiste entsprechend, von einigen Widersprüchen befreit. Es sind nur wenige Worte der IRZN, die hier stören. Aber diese Worte ragen wie fremde Klippen aus einem längst fossil gewordenen Untergrund in die Regeln hinein und verlangen Bereinigung des Fahrwassers.

B. Diakritische Zeichen oder Klassisches Latein-Alphabet?

Das „Klassische Latein-Alphabet" ist das Alphabet der lateinischen Sprache. Es ist in allen Druckereien, welche wissenschaftliche Bücher drücken, vorhanden.

Das „Erweiterte Latein-Alphabet“ ist dasjenige, welches zu den einfachen Buchstaben der Römer Diakritische Zeichen hinzugefügt hat. Die Lettern mit Diakritischen Zeichen sind nur in wenigen großen Druckereien vollständig vorhanden, und in manchen Ländern überhaupt nicht vollständig. Das gilt oft schon für die gewöhnlicheren unter den „Diakritischen“ Lettern wie â, à, ê, ě, è, é, ë, ï, ç, č, ř, š, ž. Selten aber finden sich vollständig die Lettern der skandinavischen Sprachen (å, ø), der spanischen (á, í, ó, ñ), der portugiesischen (ã, õ usw.), der rumänischen (ă, ş usw.) oder anderer Sprachen (ć, ę, ğ, ì, î, ò, ś, ú, ù, û, ź). Manche, wie das polnische l (durchstrichen), stehen auch uns selber nicht zur Verfügung.

Überdies genügen für die Zwecke der Zoologischen Nomenklatur nicht nur die Lettern des normalen Satzes zur Vollständigkeit. Die Zoologie benötigt vielmehr stets mehrere Satz-Arten nebeneinander. (Wir nehmen bei den folgenden Beispielen, um auch die von der deutschen Sprache verursachten Schwierigkeiten nicht auszuschließen, die Letter ü hinzu, obwohl sie nach D nicht hierhin gehört.) Benötigt werden neben den stehenden Lettern im allgemeinen Text (Müllendorf, Černyševsk) vor allem auch die kursiven für die Namen der Gattungen und Arten („italics“: *mülleri, černyševi*) und ferner noch die Majuskeln für die Namen der Autoren („Kapitälchen“: MÜLLER, ČERNYŠEV). Denn die zoologische Literatur verliert an Lesbarkeit, wenn Zeitschriften oder Bücher die moderne Höhe einer differenzierten Typographie nicht einhalten und die Rücksicht auf den Leser vernachlässigen. Daher muß jede dieser drei Satz-Arten auch noch in verschiedener Dicke und Größe vorhanden sein: in Fett ***(mülleri, černyševi)*** und in Mager *(mülleri, černyševi)*, in normaler Größe, in Überschrifts-Größe und in Kleindruck („Petit“: *mülleri, černyševi)*.

Für das Klassische Latein-Alphabet können und müssen diese verschiedenen Satz-Arten gefordert werden. Für die Diakritischen Lettern hat sich aber die geforderte Vollständigkeit als unmöglich erwiesen.

Die Forderung der Diakritischen Zeichen ist aber tatsächlich in dem bisherigen Wortlaut der IRZN enthalten, nämlich in Artikel 20. Hier (und das ist die einzige Erwähnung der Zeichen) wird vorgeschrieben: „Pour la formation de noms empruntés aux langues s’écrivant avec l’alphabet latin, on conserve l’orthographe originale, y compris les signes diacritiques.“ Durch seine Beispiele schreibt der Artikel 20 ausdrücklich folgende (kursive) Lettern vor: *å, ø, ñ, ć, ž, ä, ö, ü.*

Ultra posse nemo obligatur. Auch die gewissenhafteste Absicht des Autors findet ihre Grenze an der technischen Leistungsfähigkeit der Druckerei. Und diese ist von Land zu Land, von Ort zu Ort verschieden. Die tägliche Praxis lehrt, daß die Diakritischen Zeichen nur sehr unvollständig und in wild wechselnder Weise „conserviert“ werden können, wie es Artikel 20 wünscht. Die Folge: Tier-Namen, denen der Autor bei der Aufstellung ein Diakritisches Zeichen gegeben hat, müssen in den verschiedenen Zeitschriften notgedrungen in verschiedener Form erscheinen. Der Artikel 20 kann das nicht verhindern; er ist eher selber die Ursache für die entstehende Buntscheckigkeit.

Die Druckweise bald mit, bald ohne Zeichen, bald mit einem Teil, liefert also Varianten, die via facti erzwungen werden. Diese können für die Nomenklatur keine größere Bedeutung haben als die ausdrücklich erlaubten „fakultativen Varianten". Es ist demnach selbstverständlich, daß der Besitz oder das Fehlen eines Diakritischen Zeichens (nicht aber der wirksame Unterschied zwischen *u* und *ue*: vgl. C) eine „nomenklatorisch unwirksame Verschiedenheit" im Sinne der Artikel 34 u. 35 ist (vgl. R. R. 1948: 189-195). Das heißt: Diakritische Zeichen ändern nichts an der Homonymie von sonst gleichen Namen. *Černyševia* und *Cernysevia*, *joaquíni* und *joaquini* sind homonym.

Über die Frage, ob Diakritische Zeichen nachträglich zu einem Namen hinzugefügt oder geändert werden dürfen oder sogar müssen, vgl. auch in E.

Es könnte viel Geld gespart werden, nämlich in allen Ländern mit der alleinigen Ausnahme der Heimat des jeweiligen Autors, und die Tier-Namen würden weniger buntscheckig aussehen, wenn die neuen IRZN sich zu dem Satz entschließen könnten:

> „Namen, die in Zukunft aufgestellt werden, sind mit den Buchstaben des Klassischen Latein-Alphabets zu schreiben, also ohne Diakritische Zeichen."

Gegen einen solchen radikalen Satz ist aber in manchen Ländern Widerspruch vorauszusehen: Denn č und c usw. bezeichnen verschiedene Laute, und ihr Unterschied kann die völlige Verschiedenheit zweier persönlicher oder geographischer Namen bedeuten. Es ist also verständlich, wenn die betroffenen Sprachen auch bei den Tier-Namen an den für sie unentbehrlichen Zeichen festhalten wollen. Sie müssen dann eben das Wegbleiben der Zeichen in solchen Ländern in Kauf nehmen, welche bei allem Streben nach Akribie die Zeichen nicht drucken können.

Alle Völker werden aber voraussichtlich ihre Zustimmung geben, wenn die IRZN bei einer Neufassung des Textes (vgl. R. R. 1948: 130) deutlich aussprechen:

> „Diakritische Zeichen verursachen nur nomenklatorisch unwirksame Varianten des Namens: Ein Name, der mit solchen Zeichen veröffentlicht worden ist, darf auch ohne sie übernommen werden. Ein Name, der ohne solche Zeichen veröffentlicht worden ist, darf nicht nachträglich damit versehen werden."

C. Umlaute dürfen von der Nomenklatur nicht mit Diakritischen Zeichen verwechselt werden.

Die deutsche Sprache, welche die Nomenklatur mit unersetzbaren Zeichen verschont hat, bereitet ihr dafür dauernde Schwierigkeiten durch die Umlaute. Immer wieder, und so auch neuerdings, sind in den fremden Literaturen nomenklatorische Verwirrungen entstanden, weil man sich über die Behandlung „of the umlaut" nicht im Klaren war.

Ein Umlaut ist ein selbständiger Vokal[1]). Weil er geschichtlich aus einem älteren Vokal durch Änderung der Aussprache hervorgegangen ist (*ae* aus *a*, *oe* aus *o*, *ue* aus *u*), wird er optisch durch den älteren Vokal mit Hinzufügung des Vokals *e* wiedergegeben. Dieses *e* kann hinter das *a*, *o*, *u* gesetzt werden *(ae, oe, ue)* oder auch über das *a, o, u.* Dann sieht das *e* wie zwei Punkte aus: *ä, ö, ü.* (Auch das Schwedische hat *ä* und *ö.)* Beide Schreibweisen sind gleichwertig und vikariieren in der deutschen Sprache beliebig, ohne die Aussprache zu ändern.

---

[1]) Der Umlaut ist also ein akustischer Laut; er ist nicht das optische Zeichen für den Laut (also nicht „an umlaut over the o").

Nur im juristischen Gebrauch ist es in neuerer Zeit bei den Namen von Personen und Orten festgelegt worden, ob sie klassisch oder „diakritisch" geschrieben werden sollen. Aber im täglichen Gebrauch oder aus technischer Notwendigkeit werden alle Wörter und auch alle Namen auf beide Weisen geschrieben: MÜLLER ist gleich MUELLER und Rüdersdorf ist gleich Ruedersdorf. Dabei ersteht kein neuer Laut und kein neuer Name.

Hierin liegt der Unterschied gegen jene Laute, die in ihrer Sprache nur durch Diakritische Zeichen wiedergegeben werden können. Es ist der Vorzug der Umlaute, daß sie bereits in ihrer Sprache (im Deutschen) auf Diakritische Zeichen nicht angewiesen sind, sondern sich ebenso genau auch durch das Klassische Latein-Alphabet wiedergeben lassen.

Dagegen ist MULLER ein ganz anderes Wort und ein anderer Name als MÜLLER, und Rüdersdorf (bei Berlin) ist ein anderer Ort als Rudersdorf (in Westfalen).

Daher ist es ein irreführender Fehler, wenn ausländische Druckereien, welche die Letter *ü* nicht besitzen, aus MÜLLER einen MULLER und aus Rüdersdorf ein Rudersdorf machen, während sie doch ohne Mühe richtig drucken könnten: MUELLER und Ruedersdorf. Dagegen sind die Schreibweisen *muelleri* und *mülleri* nur fakultative Varianten desselben Namens, die aus Gründen der Technik mit einander vikarieren.

Leider entstehen immer wieder neue Irrtümer durch Ausländer, die nicht wissen, daß man *ü* im Notfall stets durch *ue,* aber niemals durch *u* wiedergeben darf.

Sehr einfach klärt sich so auch die Frage, die von H. M. MUIR-WOOD (1951b) mit ausführlichen Erörterungen der Kommission vorgelegt worden ist, nämlich ob *Tornquistia* PAECKELMANN 1930 ein Homonym von *Törnquistia* REED 1896 ist. Diese beiden Namen sind natürlich keine Homonyme. Nicht etwa deshalb, weil der Pate des Trilobiten von 1896 der Schwede TÖRNQUIST ist und der Pate des Brachiopoden von 1930 der Deutsche TORNQUIST. (Die Frage nach dem Paten darf die Nomenklatur niemals verwirren: vgl. E). Sondern deshalb, weil *o* und *ö* völlig verschiedene Vokale sind. *Tornquistia* und *Törnquistia* bestehen legitim als völlig selbständige Namen nebeneinander, — nicht anders, als etwa *Tarnquistia* und *Turnquistia* nebeneinander bestehen würden.

Dagegen wäre *Törnquistia,* da man diesen Namen, notwendig oder beliebig, ja stets auch *Toernquistia* schreiben darf, natürlich ein Homonym von *Toernquistia.* Beide Namen wären nur fakultative Varianten.

Auch das norwegische ø wird in schwedischen Büchern oft durch ö wiedergegeben, und dieses würde sich in Ländern, die kein *ö* besitzen, notwendig weiter in *oe* verwandeln; kaum zum Schaden der Nomenklatur. Es muß den Schweden überlassen bleiben, wie sie das å durch das Klassische Latein-Alphabet wiedergegeben zu sehen wünschen, wenn eine Druckerei die „Diakritische" Letter nicht besitzt.

Für die deutschen Umlaute ist die nomenklatorische Behandlung also klar.

Mit guter Logik empfehlen die IRZN in ihrer jetzigen Fassung in Artikel 20: „Werden neue Namen vorgeschlagen, die sich auf Personen-Namen beziehen, die manchmal mit *ä, ö,* oder *ü* geschrieben werden, so möge der Autor die Schreibweise *ae, oe* und *ue* annehmen. — Beispiel: *muelleri* habe den Vorzug vor *mülleri.*"

Nur genügt diese Empfehlung nicht. Denn sie müßte sich auf sämtliche Tier-Namen beziehen und nicht nur auf solche, die von Personen-Namen abgeleitet werden. Außerdem müßten die IRZN eine Empfehlung (in ihrem Anhang G) aufheben, durch die sie sich selber unnötige und nicht beabsichtigte Schwierigkeiten machen. Denn in Anhang G empfehlen die IRZN, daß bei Tier-Namen, die von geographischen Namen nicht-lateinisch schreibender Sprachen abgeleitet sind, der französische *u*-Laut (also der deutsche Umlaut *ü = ue)* durch das sonst verpönte deutsche „diakritische" *ü* wiedergegeben werden soll. Diese Empfehlung ist nur durch ein Versehen in die IRZN hineingeraten, indem die Transkriptions-Regeln einer Geographischen Gesellschaft im Block und ohne Beachtung der Folgen für die Nomenklatur übernommen worden sind.

Der neue Text der IRZN sollte mit der unabänderlichen Not der Druckereien vieler Länder rechnen und aus dieser Not eine Tugend machen. Den Konfusionen der Nomenklatur *(mülleri* fälschlich mit *mulleri* und *Tornquistia* fälschlich mit *Törnquistia* identifiziert!) sollte vorgebeugt werden. Dazu genügt die Aufnahme folgender Sätze in Artikel 24:

> „Alle Namen, die mit *ä, ö,* und *ü* veröffentlicht worden sind, dürfen auch mit *ae, oe* und *ue* übernommen werden. Beide Schreibweisen sind fakultative, also nomenklatorisch unwirksame Varianten. Dagegen ist der Unterschied zwischen *a* und *ä (=ae), o* und *ö (=oe), u* und *ü (=ue)* nomenklatorisch wirksam und verhindert die Homonymie sonst gleicher Namen."

D. Schutz vor Einflüssen der Transkription.

Vorschriften dürfen niemals mit rückwirkender Kraft eingeführt werden, wenn die Tier-Namen vor Veränderung geschützt bleiben sollen. Eine lex post factum ist immer illegal.

Daher würden auch obligatorische Transkriptions-Vorschriften unheilvolle Verwirrungen hervorrufen, wenn sie rückwirkend eingeführt werden sollten. Denn dadurch würden bestehende Namen noch nachträglich mit „Fehlern der Transkription" belastet und so gefährdet werden. Auch dürften nur solche Diakritische Zeichen vorgeschrieben werden, die in der Praxis wirklich überall beschafft werden können. Mit diesen Vorbehalten kann der Antrag nützlich sein, den H. M. Muir-Wood (1951a) an die Kommission richtet: die IRZN möchten neben der Transkription der griechischen auch die der kyrillischen Buchstaben ins Auge fassen. Wie immer, wenn es sich um die Form des Tier-Namens handelt, sind aber wohl auch hier fakultative Ratschläge zweckmäßiger als bindende Vorschriften.

Die Streitigkeiten über die „richtige" Transkription eines Tier-Namens haben der Nomenklatur nur Zeitverlust ohne Ende gebracht. Die Schuld trägt ein einziger, unglücklicher Nebensatz in Artikel 19. Dieser Nebensatz ist die eine jener beiden Klippen, die aus der Vorzeit in das Fahrwasser der modernen Nomenklatur schiffbrechend aufragen (vgl. A). Der Artikel 19 lautet: „L'orthographe originelle d'un nom doit être conservée, à moins qu'il ne soit évident que ce nom renferme une faute de transcription, d'orthographe ou d'impression."

Die Nomenklaturisten haben sich diese Handhabe „à moins que" zur Beunruhigung der Nomenklatur nicht entgehen lassen. Ein Beispiel für viele: Sie haben den Namen *Acaste* GOLDFUSS 1843 nach dem „Anhang F" der IRZN in *Acasta* geändert und ihn in dieser Form zu einem „nachträglichen Homonym" von *Acasta* LEACH 1811 machen wollen, mit dem Zweck, einen neuen Substitutions-Namen einzuführen (vgl. R. R. 1948: 124). Nicht immer sind solche Versuche, bevor sie weiteren Schaden anrichten konnten, als unwirksam aus der Welt geschafft worden. Die Nomenklaturisten wollen gern übersehen, daß die IRZN für die Transkription nur fakultative Empfehlungen geben.

Die Kommission hat von Fall zu Fall Abhilfe geschaffen. Sie hat manchen angeblich „falsch" transkribierten Namen geschützt, indem sie ihn als den möglichen Namen eines unbekannten Schiffes (nach Artikel 18i), als eine „willkürliche Vereinigung von Buchstaben" (nach 18k) oder als ein willkürlich umgestelltes Wort (nach 18l) gelten ließ. Aber das hilft dann nicht, wenn der Autor die Etymologie selber angegeben hat. Dann beginnen die immer wieder „besser" emendierten Emendationen, die vielleicht bei *Agchylostoma* mit 23 verschiedenen Emendationen noch nicht einmal den Gipfel erreicht haben.

Da eine E-mendation (die sprachliche „Ent-Fehlerung" der Form des Namens) selber der Möglichkeit fortgesetzter Emendationen unterliegt und somit zu keinem endgültig stabilen Namen führen kann, widerspricht die Erlaubnis zum Emendieren dem Zweck der Nomenklatur.

Etwas anderes als die Emendation (sprachliche Änderung) ist die Commutatio sensus, die Sinn-Änderung eines Namens, indem man den Namen weiter oder enger gebraucht, als es der ursprüngliche Autor oder irgendein Vorgänger getan hat. Es handelt sich also, da der Typus ja bleibt, um eine Änderung der Diagnose, Solche Sinn-Änderungen müssen jedoch beim Gebrauch so oft erfolgen, daß es kaum nützlich ist, sie im Namen auszudrücken. Will man das aber tun, so sollte man nicht „emend." verwenden und diesem Terminus eine doppelte Bedeutung geben, auch wenn es in Zukunft eine Emendation nicht mehr geben wird. Als selbstverständlich empfiehlt sich: „sensu commutato", bzw. (wenn die Änderung bereits früher, etwa von ANTON, vorgenommen worden ist): „sensu ANTON, 1890". (Vgl. R. R. 1948: 100, 124, 134.)

Gegen die Versuchung zur Emendation hilft nur der Satz: „Quo modo impressum est, nomen maneat."

Wirkliche Fehler, die dem Autor contra intentionem unterlaufen sind, also die Schreibfehler (lapsus calami) und die Druckfehler (lapsus pressae) des Artikels 19, lassen sich gerade bei gewissenhaften Arbeiten meistens durch die „Auswahl des Richtigen" beseitigen (R. R. 1948: 119). Ist die beabsichtigte Form in der ursprünglichen Veröffentlichung aber überhaupt nicht vorhanden, so ist es das kleinere Übel, den Fehler unverbessert zu über-nehmen. Das hat sich bei bekannten Pflanzen-Namen *(Diclythra)* bewährt und auch bei manchen Tier-Namen, die man den Nomenklaturisten lieber verschweigt.

Handelt es sich aber um eine „falsche" Schreibweise secundum intentionem, also um „absichtliche orthographische oder grammatische Fehler", so gehören sie zum souveränen Recht des Autors und sind vor jeder „Verbesserung" geschützt. Die Botanischen Regeln verbieten die „Verbesserung" solcher Fehler ausdrücklich. Auch in den IRZN sollte das Verbot klar zum Ausdruck kommen. (R. R. 1950: 269).

F. Schutz vor Einflüssen der Schreibweise des Paten-Namens.

Eine dedicatio soll nach LINNAEUS's Mahnung als „summus honos" geachtet werden. Dann kann die Nachforschung nach dem Paten zeitgeschichtliches Interesse haben. Aber die Nomenklatur darf sich durch solche Nachforschungen nie zu Änderungsversuchen am Tier-Namen verführen lassen. Sie sind unwirksam, und man tut dem Paten keine Ehre an, wenn man seinen Namen zu einer Ursache von Störungen machen möchte.

Die nachträgliche Zufügung von Zeichen ist unter den immer schädlichen Emendationen die harmloseste. Denn sie ändert (nach den Darlegungen in B) am Tier-Namen nichts, was nomenklatorisch wesentlich wäre. Aber das Verbot auch solcher Änderungen würde lange Erörterungen unnötig machen, wie sie gerade jetzt zwischen großen Organisationen im Gange sind.

Vor solchen nicht-nomenklatorischen Erörterungen sollte die Nomenklatur bewahrt bleiben. Der Autor hat manchmal die Zeichen des Paten-Namens bei der Aufstellung des Tier-Namens absichtlich weggelassen, weil er die technischen Schwierigkeiten voraussah und dem Namen eine internationale Einheitlichkeit sichern wollte. Der Autor darf erwarten, daß seine intentio respektiert wird.

Beispiel: Wir stellen in Senckenbergiana, 33, 1952, zu Ehren von Sr. D. Joaquín Gómez de Llarena eine Art *joaquini* auf und schreiben absichtlich ein *i* ohne Zeichen vor, weil diese Letter (*í*) ja doch nicht überall gedruckt werden kann.

Die nachträgliche Änderung der Orthographie eines Tier-Namens aus Rücksicht auf den Paten-Namen ist bedenklicher. Die Folgen können Homonymie und Neu-Benennung sein. Daher muß auch die kleinste private Änderung grundsätzlich unmöglich sein.

Beispiel: Nachdem H. v. MEYER, übrigens aus philologischer Akribie, den Art-Namen *senkenbergii* aufgestellt hat, obwohl sein Freund SENCKENBERG, der Pate, sich unorthographisch mit *ck* schrieb, muß es bei der intentio autoris bleiben. (Vgl. R. R. 1950: 269.)

Dadurch entscheidet sich auch der gegenwärtige Streit über die Frage, ob man den veröffentlichten Namen *Stalia* nachträglich in *Stålia* ändern dürfe, je nachdem sich, aus dem Wortlaut des Textes oder aus Konjekturen, als Pate ein STAL oder ein STÅL herausstelle. (Näheres: R. R. 1948: 130.)

Unterliegt ein Paten-Name verschiedener Transkription, so können die Unterschiede der abgeleiteten Tier-Namen groß werden.

Jakowleffia Puton 1875 und *Yakovlevia* Fredericks 1925 leiten sich von demselben Paten ab. Sicherlich haben Muir-Wood & Cooper (1951: 196) Recht, wenn sie die Homonymie dieser beiden Gattungs-Namen bestreiten und die Neu-Benennung der jüngeren Gattung nicht anerkennen. Es ist dankenswert, daß H. M. Muir-Wood (1951a) die Frage in einem Antrag an die Kommission allgemein aufwirft. Die Antwort scheint uns klar zu sein. Wären solche Namen Homonyme, so würde die Nomenklatur dauernd in Unruhe bleiben. Denn immer wieder könnte ein Zufall oder eine außerhalb der Nomenklatur liegende Nachforschung ergeben, daß zwei Tier-Namen von demselben Paten-Namen abgeleitet und nur verschieden transkribiert worden sind.

Beispiele: *Černyševia* ist homonym mit *Cernysevia* (via facti: vgl. B). Aber eine *Tschernyschewia* steht berechtigt neben *Černyševia.* — Tschihatscheff hat seinen Namen, je nach dem Text der betreffenden Arbeit, kyrillisch, englisch, französisch oder deutsch transkribiert. Dankbare Benützer dieser Arbeiten widmen ihre Tier-Namen dem Verfasser in der jeweils von ihm selber angewendeten Transkription. Dadurch entstehen keine Homonyme.

Als „Ratschlag“ sollte allerdings in die IRZN aufgenommen werden:

> „Es sollte kein Tier-Name aufgestellt werden, der sich von einem bereits veröffentlichten nur durch die Transkription unterscheidet. Geschieht das dennoch, so kann die etwaige Homonymie nur nach den Bestimmungen von Artikel 34 und 35 der IRZN beurteilt werden; hierbei ist es gleichgültig, ob Ableitung und Bedeutung dieselben sind oder nicht.“

Die nachträgliche Änderung der Endung eines Art-Namens, begründet mit einem Irrtum des Autors über das Geschlecht des Paten, ist gefährlicher, als es scheinen könnte, und daher unzulässig. Auch dem eigenen Autor ist eine Änderung nicht erlaubt.

Beispiel: Vor kurzem versuchte ein Autor den von ihm aufgestellten Art-Namen *smithae* in *smithi* zu ändern, weil der Pate sich als ein Mann herausgestellt habe. Da aber in der Gattung eine ältere Art *smithi* schon vorhanden war, erzeugte die Änderung sofort eine neue: Die ehemalige *smithae,* nach der Änderung in *smithi* zu einem Homonym gemacht, wurde nunmehr in *muelleri* geändert. Kaum ein summus honos für Frau Smith. Ein solches Spiel mit der Nomenklatur widerspricht ihrem Zweck und ist nicht zulässig.

Entscheidend für die Frage, ob Homonym oder nicht, kann nur die ursprünglich veröffentlichte Schreibweise des Tier-Namens sein. Artikel 34 und 35 sind allein maßgebend dafür, welche Unterschiede als nomenklatorisch unwirksam angesehen werden dürfen. Allerdings müßte in diesen Artikeln die Einschränkung *„von derselben Ableitung und Bedeutung“* gestrichen werden. Denn sonst wird die Stabilität eines Tier-Namens doch wieder von philologischen, historischen und textkritischen Erwägungen abhängig gemacht.

Beispiel: Nach Artikel 34 und 35 ist der Unterschied zwischen *c* und *k* nomenklatorisch unwirksam: *Cöloceras* und *Köloceras* sind also homonym, — allerdings nur bei „derselben Ableitung und Bedeutung“. Nun hat man im Vertrauen auf diese übliche Gleichheit von C und K auch *Caninia* 1840 und *Kaninia* 1924 als Homonyme angesehen. Literarische Studien lassen aber erkennen, daß *Caninia* von dem lateinischen canis (Hund) abgeleitet worden ist und *Kaninia* von einem asiatischen Orte Kanin. Damit würden die beiden Gattungs-Namen nicht mehr dem Hauptsatz von Artikel 34 unterliegen, sondern unter dessen Einschränkung fallen. Sie würden also nebeneinander legitim werden und die inzwischen gutgläubig vorgenommene Neu-Benennung des jüngeren Homonyms würde als illegitim wieder wegfallen. Es liegt nicht im Sinne der IRZN, die durch jene Einschränkung verursachte Ungewißheit samt den möglichen Überraschungen andauern zu lassen und die Nomenklatur einem Hin und Her von Umbenennungen auszusetzen.

Ergebnis:

Die IRZN sollten in der neuen Fassung unmißverständlich ihren Grundsatz aussprechen: „Quo modo impressum est, nomen maneat". Emendation ist nicht erlaubt. Ein Tier-Name darf privat nicht geändert werden. Auch „la recherche du parrain est interdite", wenn sie zur Änderung eines Tier-Namens führen soll.

Diakritische Zeichen sind nomenklatorisch unwirksam und erzeugen nur fakultative Varianten desselben Namens. Die Druck-Technik läßt gar keine andere Möglichkeit.

Der Unterschied zwischen „Umlaut" und „Laut" ist nomenklatorisch wirksam (*ue* nomenklatorisch verschieden von *u*, aber *ue* nomenklatorisch gleich *ü*). Da der Umlaut im Deutschen, statt diakritisch *(ü)*, immer auch klassisch *(ue)* wiedergegeben werden kann, sollte die klassische Schreibweise bei der Übernahme veröffentlichter Namen erlaubt und bei der künftigen Aufstellung von Namen vorgeschrieben sein. Auch hier läßt die Druck-Technik keine andere Möglichkeit.

Wirksam ist die Änderung eines Namens nur dann, wenn in einem wichtigen Einzelfall die Kommission ihr Recht zur „Suspension der Regeln" angewendet hat.

Schriften:

COOPER, G. A. & MUIR-WOOD, H. M.: Brachiopod homonyms. — J. Washington Acad. Sci., 41: 195-196, Washington 1951.

MUIR-WOOD, H. M.: On the question whether any two generic names or trivial names, each based upon the same surname of a person, whose name is normally written in some alphabet other than the Latin Alphabet, and each having the same termination, but differing from one another in the transliteration of the portion representing the person's name, are to be regarded as homonyms of one another. — Bull. zool. Nomenclature, 6, 3: 90-92, London 1951. [1951a]

— — —: Request for a ruling on the question whether any two names, each based upon a modern patronymic, are to be regarded as homonyms of one another. when the patronymics in question are identical in spelling, but differ through the presence or absence of an umlaut or other diacritic mark. — Bull. zool. Nomenclature, 6, 3: 92-94, London 1951. [1951b]

RICHTER, RUD.: Einführung in die Zoologische Nomenklatur durch Erläuterung der Internationalen Regeln. 2., umgearbeitete Auflage. 252 S. Frankfurt a. M. 1948.

— — —: Die „Berichtigung" von Namen nach Artikel 19 IRZN, an den Fällen *senkenbergii* c/a *senckenbergii* und *smithae* c/a *smithi*. — Senckenbergiana, 31: 269-272, Frankfurt a. M. 1950.

DOCUMENT 5/17

DIACRITIC MARKS

Note by the Secretary

Editorial Note : In the immediately preceding communication Professor Rudolf Richter discusses (in Section B) the problem involved in the formation of scientific names in cases where the words from which those names are formed bear diacritic marks. In the present Series this subject is discussed also by Dr. Key (Document 5/26), by the Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, D.C. (Document 5/30) and by the American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature, while in Series 3 (Family Names) the same subject is raised also by Professor Raymond C. Moore (Document 3/25). The problem here involved was raised with the International Commission, quite independently of the general problem of the emendation of names, by Dr. Helen Muir-Wood, whose application on this subject was published in September 1951 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 92-94). It is proposed to bring forward that application, together with the numerous comments received thereon, for consideration as a separate item at Copenhagen. The relevant documents will be published later in the present volume (pp. 241–251) under Case No. 20, where the question of deleting the present reference to diacritic marks in Article 20 is discussed.

DOCUMENT 5/18

By **L. B. HOLTHUIS** (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*)

Letter dated 11th April, 1952

I have finished reading your suggestions for the reform of Article 19 of the *Règles* (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7 (1/2) : 1–60) and on the whole I support your proposals. On a few points, however, I should like to make some comments or to receive some additional information. For convenience sake with each point I am giving the paragraph in your paper with which it deals and the page of your paper on which that paragraph is found.

(1) Your paragraph 17, p. 20. I am wondering what is exactly meant with the expression : " those cases where the author publishing a spelling for a name which differs from the original spelling of that name himself expressly makes it clear that the spelling change is intentional " ; I especially should like to know what is meant with " expressly makes it clear ". I am mainly afraid that various authors will give a different explanation of this expression. In my opinion the various spelling changes may be arranged in the following categories:

(A) The author expressly states that he proposes a new spelling, *e.g.*, in using the expression " As the original spelling of the generic name *Scyllarus* by Fabricius, 1798, is incorrect, I use here the correct spelling *Syllarus*" or "*Syllarus* (emend. pro *Scyllarus*) Fabricius, 1798."

(B) The author does not say in so many words that he proposes a new spelling for a certain generic name, but while using the new spelling he refers to the old spelling in a synonymy, *e.g.*, in using the following clause " *Syllarus arctus* (Linnaeus, 1758). Synonyms : *Cancer arctus* Linnaeus, 1758 ; *Scyllarus arctus* Fabricius, 1798 ". This category may be divided into two groups :

- (i) The emended name is used consistently by the author in his paper (except of course in the synonymy). Here two subgroups may be recognised.
  - (a) The emended name is used more than once in the just mentioned paper.
  - (b) The emended name is used only once in the paper.
- (ii) The emended name is not used consistently by the author in his paper (apart from the use of the old spelling in the synonymy).

(C) The author uses a new spelling for a generic name without referring at all to the old spelling.

There is not the least doubt that in category (A) the author " expressly makes it clear that the spelling change is intentional " and the cases falling under this category are emendations. The cases falling under category (C) in the same way obviously are erroneous spelling changes. The difficulty is caused, however, by category (B). The fact that the author uses a new spelling for a scientific name, referring at the same time to the old spelling, in my opinion makes it clear (except in two cases) that the spelling change is intentional. The two exceptions are the cases falling in group (B) (ii) and (B) (i) (b). If the author does not use the new spelling consistently, the possibility that this spelling change is due to some lapsus is large ; this is likewise the case when the author mentions the new spelling only once in his paper, not having a need to use it more. In the latter case the author uses the new name consistently but still the chances are large that this new spelling is only due to a lapsus. In my opinion, therefore, the cases falling under categories (A) and (B) (i) (a) deal with emendations, all other cases with erroneous spelling changes. I am not certain whether this opinion is shared by the Commission and I should appreciate some elucidation on this subject.

(2) Your paragraph **20**, p. 23. The case of *Myolepta* Newman, 1838, and *Leptomya* Walker, 1851, made me wonder whether it always is possible to distinguish satisfactorily between a spelling change and a new name, and whether these two expressions have been sharply defined. How are we to know when somebody introduces a name like Walker's *Leptomya* whether this is a new name or that it just is a spelling change, in the case that the author himself gives no information on that point as often happened in old publications. When an author in the text expressly states that he proposes a new name, or when he uses indications like *nom. nov.*, *nov.*, or *mihi* placed after the new name, then there of course is not the least doubt that that name indeed is a new name. When an author in his paper uses a new spelling of a scientific name inconsistently, or when he uses such a spelling citing as the author of the name the author of a very similar name, there is little doubt that we have to do with a spelling change. But how are we to decide whether any other name which does not fit in the just mentioned categories is a new name or a spelling change ? We of course are inclined to consider a name which is not clearly a new name and which differs only little in its spelling from a name which already exists for the taxonomic unit in question to be a spelling change ; while a name which in its spelling differs considerably from any name ever employed for the taxonomic unit in question generally will be considered to be a new name. In several instances, however, it will be hardly possible to make out with certainty whether such a name is a new name or a spelling change. It therefore seems highly desirable to me to have an unambiguous definition for these two kinds of name. We thus have to do here with with three categories : (1) the names which are clearly indicated as new names, (2) the names which are published with information clearly showing them to be erroneous spelling changes, and (3) the names which are published without information making it possible to find out whether they are new names or erroneous spelling changes. Personally I am unable to find any satisfactory solution to divide category (3)

into two sharply defined groups, one of which contains those names which probably are intended to be new names, the other containing the names which might be erroneous spelling changes. Therefore the only way I see to deal with this question is to consider all names falling under group (3) to be either erroneous spelling changes or new names. Group (3) contains a large assembly of names ranging from (a) names which in their spelling differ only slightly from an older name given to the same taxonomic unit, to (b) names which show not the least resemblance to any older name used for the same taxonomic unit. It is extremely illogical to consider names as those mentioned above under (b) to be erroneous spelling changes, and this makes it illogical at the same time to consider all of group (3) as erroneous spelling changes. There is, however, no objection to consider all the names falling in group (3) to be new names, as very often new names in their spelling differ extremely little from the name which they are to replace, so one might find new names both in groups (a) and (b) mentioned above. Therefore I would suggest that the names falling in groups (1) and (3) above be considered to constitute new names, while solely the names from group (2) be treated as erroneous spelling changes. Summarizing we get the following definitions for the expression new name and erroneous spelling change :

(A) New name. A new name is a name—other than an emendation or an erroneous spelling change—which either has been expressly indicated by its author as a new name, or differs in its spelling from any other name previously used for the taxonomic unit for which it is proposed.

(B) Erroneous spelling change. An erroneous spelling change is a name—other than an emendation—which in its spelling resembles a second name previously used for the same taxonomic unit, while in the publication in which the first name is used for the first time either (a) both the first and the second names are inconsistently used for the taxonomic unit in question, or (b) the author of the second name is cited to be the author of the first.

(3) Your paragraph **29**, p. 32. It is not clear to me how one can ascertain that a faulty transliteration has been made. I know that in several instances some zoologists consider a certain spelling of a name an obvious faulty transliteration, while others do not think the same spelling a faulty transliteration at all. I believe that a definition making it clear when a spelling has to be considered a faulty transliteration is of great importance. I perhaps may give here an example. The generic name *Oplophorus* for a shrimp originally was spelled by its author (H. Milne Edwards, 1837) in this way. At the present time a number of zoologists use the original spelling for this name, while others have emended it to *Hoplophorus*, claiming *Oplophorus* to be a faulty transliteration. The name *Oplophorus* will be used to illustrate the various cases mentioned in the following enumeration. As far as I can see, the following reasons can be given to prove that a certain spelling is a faulty transliteration :

(*a*) The author in proposing a new name [*Oplophorus*] gives, to show the derivation of this name, the Greek (or Cyrillic) spelling of the word or words on which his name is based [ὁπλον = weapon, φορα = to bear]. The spelling of these Greek (or Cyrillic) words or this Greek (or Cyrillic) word makes it clear that the transliteration is incorrect.

(*b*) The author states that his new name [*Oplophorus*] is derived from (a) certain Greek (or Cyrillic) word(s) of which he gives the meaning, without giving the actual Greek (or Cyrillic) spelling [" derived from the Greek words for weapon and to bear "].

(*c*) The author besides the Latin name for his new taxonomic unit, provides a name in his own language which is a translation of the Greek (or Cyrillic) word(s) from which the Latin name is derived. The author, however, does not expressly give the derivation of his Latin name [*Oplophorus*, der Waffenträger].

(*d*) The author does not give the derivation of the Latin name used by him, but from the original description given of the animal it becomes clear that the name is a transliteration of (a) Greek or Cyrillic word(s) indicating for instance a salient character of the animal. [In the case of *Oplophorus* the author might mention that the body of the animal bears strong spines.]

(*e*) The author gives no derivation of the name used by him, while the other data provided in the original description also give no clue as to the derivation of the name, but the name itself suggests that it is derived from (a) certain Greek or Cyrillic word(s).

Some authors change a faulty transliteration in all five cases, while several others will reason that when the author does not expressly give the derivation of his name, it never can be made certain that he indeed committed a faulty transliteration, as he might have used a meaningless arrangement of letters which only by chance resembles a Greek or Cyrillic word. My personal opinion is that indeed a possible faulty transliteration should be corrected only when it conclusively can be proven to be a faulty transliteration from data contained in the original publication, and that thus only the cases mentioned here under (a) and (b) should fall under the definition of faulty transliteration.

(4) Your paragraph **29**, p. 32. The considerations put forward in my paragraph (3) have been given only in case that automatic corrections of faulty transliterations should come into force. Of the two possible regulations concerning faulty transliterations given in your paragraph **29**, I personally prefer the one mentioned by you under (a), which makes no difference between the names published before and those published after the new schedule comes into force. It is my belief that the *Règles* should be as simple as possible and

any complication which is not highly necessary should be avoided. In my opinion we should have either automatic corrections of all faulty transliterations as defined in my paragraph (3), irrespective of the date of publication of the original names, or we should have no correction of faulty transliterations at all, but those made by the Commission.

(5) Your paragraph 32, p. 34. The objective test proposed in your paragraph 32 in my opinion limits the possibilities for emendation too much. I should like to see emendations also permitted in the following cases :

(*a*) The author gives the derivation of the name proposed by him and from this derivation it becomes clear that the name has been mis-spelled. Example : If an author proposes the name *Livoneca* for a new genus and remarks that this name is an anagram of the word Caroline, subsequent authors have the right to correct the generic name to *Lironeca*.

(*b*) In the original description an incorrectly spelled name is used, but the name has been correctly spelled at more than one place in the same paper (published at the same time), *e.g.*, in the explanation of a figure, etc. If both the correct and the incorrect spelling have been used once (or both more than once) in the original paper, the decision of the first reviser should be followed.

(6) Your paragraph 32, p. 34. I believe that for the sake of stability it is preferable to insist that a correction of a spelling mistake—apart from those mistakes enumerated in my paragraph (5)—should be accepted only if the correction and the spelling mistake are published in the same paper at the same time. The time limit of one year between the publication of the correction and the spelling mistake might prove to become a source of uncertainty, the more so since in several old books the exact date of publication of the various parts is not known, while of most publications the day or even the month of publication cannot be discovered, so that in a very large percentage of the cases it will be next to impossible to find out whether the erratum has been published within twelve months from the publication of the spelling mistake.

(7) Your paragraph 40, p. 41. I should like to see a special rule concerning the emendation of incorrect endings of scientific names which are based on modern patronymics. During the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology held in Paris in 1948 it was decided that where a name published in a form which contravenes any of the provisions contained in Articles 14–16, 18 or Article 20 of the *Règles*, the error so committed is automatically to be corrected by subsequent authors (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 (4/6) : 67, 68). At the same time *Opinion* 8 was cancelled. The first difficulty which I encountered in handling this decision was with the ending i or ii of trivial names. The ways in which a name ending in ii is proposed may be arranged in the following categories :

(*a*) The author proposes such a name and states expressly to whom this name is dedicated. Example : In proposing the new name *X-us rappii* the author states it to be named in honour of a Mr. Rapp.

(*b*) The author proposing the new name does not expressly state the name as being given in honour of a certain person, but in the paper in which the name is proposed the name of a person whose name is such that the new species might have been named for him is mentioned. Example : The author of *X-us rappii* mentions in the paper containing the original description of this species that he received material or help from a Mr. Rapp, or he names Rapp as the author of a scientific term.

(*c*) The author in the paper in which he proposes a new name does not mention the name of any person to whom the new species might have been dedicated.

The names belonging to category (a) without any doubt should be emended automatically. (In the example thus *X-us rappii* should be emended to *X-us rappi.*) Concerning the names in category (b) it can be claimed that there is no definite proof that the scientific name in question has been given in honour of a certain person—though this possibility is large—and that anyone has the right to change here the original spelling. If this argument is accepted the seeming inconsistency in the application of the ending " -i " or " -ii " to scientific names, which seeming inconsistency existed before the decision of the Paris Congress would not be much lessened and to ascertain whether a name should be written with the ending " -i " or " -ii " one again should always have to consult the original publication. This all also is true for category (c), since here there is still less evidence that the scientific name is based on a modern patronymic, or on a certain modern patronymic (in the case of *X-us rappii* one even would not be certain whether this name is given in honour of a Mr. Rapp or a Signor Rappi). As the number of modern patronymics ending in " i " is much smaller than that of the names ending in any of the other 25 letters of the alphabet the most practical solution for the present problem seems to me to be a clause inserted in the *Règles*, which states that the ending " -ii " should always automatically be emended to " -i ", unless it is evident from the original publication that the scientific name is based on a modern patronymic ending in an " -i ". Furthermore, it should be stated that a scientific name should be considered to have been based on a modern patronymic not only if the author expressly states that he dedicated the scientific name to the person bearing the patronymic in question, but also if in the paper in which the scientific name has originally been proposed a patronymic is used in some way or other, which patronymic has such a spelling that it is possible for the scientific name to have been based on it. This last statement should equally apply to generic and trivial names.

(8) Your paragraph 40, p. 41. It probably will be worth while to make it specially clear that scientific names based on modern patronymics only can be emended if it becomes clear from evidence contained in the paper containing the original publication of the scientific name in question, that this scientific name has been incorrectly spelled. A nice example is that of the Mangrove crab *Aratus pisoni* (H. Milne Edwards). In the original description of this crab H. Milne Edwards gave it the name " Sésarme de Pison.–S.[esarma] Pisonii ". H. Milne Edwards in a footnote refers to a publication, which makes it clear that his " Pison " is the Dutch author Gulielmus (or Willem) Piso, who in 1648 published a book on Brazil in which a figure of this crab is given. According to a Dutch biography Piso's name originally probably was Guillaume Dupuis, which has been latinised to Gulielmus Piso. In Dutch literature he usually is indicated as Willem Piso. H. Milne Edwards probably gallicized the name Piso to Pison, and to obtain the trivial name for his mangrove crab he latinized the (Latin) name Piso to Pisonius, the genitive of which of course is Pisonii. Which of the names Piso, Pison, Pisonius or Dupuis have we to accept as the correct name of the man for whom H. Milne Edwards named his crab and what is the correct genitive to be used for the trivial name of the crab : pisoi (the genitive of the modern name Piso), pisonis (the genitive of the Latin name Piso), pisoni (the genitive of the modern name Pison), pisonii (the genitive of the Latin name Pisonius), or dupuisi (the genitive of the modern name Dupuis)? In my opinion the answer to the first of these two questions is that the name Piso is the only correct name for the person mentioned here ; the name Dupuis might have had a chance if it could have been proved that Piso indeed had been known under that name. As to the trivial name it seems to me that *pisoni* must be used here, since H. Milne Edwards consistently used the name Pison in his book in which he proposed the new species *Sesarma Pisonii*. The fact that information not included in this book shows the name Piso to be the correct name for the person to whom H. Milne Edwards dedicated his new species, in my opinion should not be of influence on this decision.

DOCUMENT 5/19

By **D. K. McE. KEVAN** (*School of Agriculture, Zoology Section, University of Nottingham, Sutton Bonington, Loughborough, England*)

Enclosure to a latter dated 29th April 1952

EMENDATION OF NAMES : COMMENTS ON MATTERS DISCUSSED IN PART 1/2 OF VOLUME 7 OF THE " BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE "

I am in agreement with most of what is suggested in Parts 1/2 of Vol. 7 of the *Bulletin*.

Whatever may be decided, however, in respect of trivial names, I wish to express my hope that in the case of *generic names*, the original orthography of the name as published be accepted, whether any error of any sort appears to be " evident " or not. The only exception to this which I should find acceptable would be in the case of a name appearing in two forms in the same work. The more correct of the two* would be the accepted orthography, irrespective of page priority or whether the genus had actually been described by the time the page of its first correct spelling had been reached or not. Where there is any doubt about what is the correct spelling (*e.g.*, in Barbaric words or where the gender could be of more than one sort), the spelling to be accepted would be that used in the full generic description, not in the first use of the name, nor in a synoptic key in advance of the generic description.

If a correction (clearly stated to be such) is published by the original author *in the same volume* as the generic description, this shall be accepted as the correct name, irrespective of any other consideration. In the case of works appearing in book form or in other than journals or serial publications, it would probably be necessary to permit a correction in a volume later than the one in which the original description occurred but I suggest that a maximum of two years between the description and the correction should be permitted. In the case of journals and serial publications, if a correction were published within a year in the *same publication* but a later volume, the correction should be valid.

I would be willing to accept the principle of automatic correction due to incorrect spelling or transliteration in the case of Personal names (either ancient or modern) but I should not wish to support the correction of incorrect transliteration in any other case, *e.g.*, I would support the automatic correction of *Mathewsia* to *Matthewsia* if the person in question did have two " t's " in his name but I should not support the emendation of *Eyprepocnemis* to *Euprepocnemis* on the grounds of transliteration.

---

* Providing that the incorrect spelling is used less frequently in the work than the correct.

The above remarks on transliteration apply only to names published before an accepted set of rules for transliteration are incorporated into the Code. If incorrect transliteration is used after such incorporation, the name shall be subject to automatic correction.

Where no set of rules for the transliteration of any particular alphabet have previously been published *in the Code*, names derived from words normally written in such an alphabet will not be subject to correction unless described after the incorporation of an appropriate set of rules in the Code.

The gender of incorrectly transliterated words should, unless the original author makes it clear by the use of the appropriate inflexion of the trivial name, be regarded as neuter, Barbaric words should all be regarded as neuter, irrespective of their gender in the original language.

DOCUMENT 5/20

By **THEODOR HALTENORTH** (*Museum, München, Germany*)

Statement dated 14th May, 1952 communicated by Professor E. M. Hering

I. Die im "Richter" zu Art. 19 der Regeln gegebenen Erlauterungen sollten verbindlich gemacht werden, zumal schon lange danach gehandelt wird, womit sich alle weiteren Emendierungsvorschläge erübrigen.

Explanatory Note

The foregoing comment was prepared by Dr. Haltenorth in response to an invitation by Professor E. M. Hering who had prepared the following synopsis of the problems at issue for consideration by German zoologists.

I. Vorschläge für eine Änderung des Art. 19 der "Internationalen Regeln der Zoologischen Nomenklatur"

Die gegenwärtige Fassung des Art. 19 der Nomenklaturregeln : "Art. 19.—*Die ursprüngliche Schreibung eines Namens ist beizubehalten, falls nicht ein Schreib-oder Druckfehler oder ein Fehler der Umschreibung nachzuweisen ist*", ist mehr-deutig und unvollständig, da keine objektiven Kriterien angegeben sind, ob ein Name zu emendieren ist oder nicht. Das hat zu vielfachen Divergenzen in der Behandlung der Namen geführt. Eine künftige Neufassung muss solche objektiven Kriterien enthalten.

Die gegenwärtige Fassung bezicht sich nur auf Falschbildungen an dörtern, aus der griechischen und lateinischen Sprache stammend. Kenntnis der Bildungs-und Schreibungsgesetze der klassischen Sprachen sind in dauernd zunehmendem Masse nicht mehr Allgemeingut der Zoologen und Palaeontologen.

Art. 19 nimmt keine Rücksicht auf die von den meisten Zoologen erstrebte Stabilität in der Nomenklatur.

Allgemeinwunsch der Zoologen etc. ist deshalb, dass

(*a*) Emendierungen nur noch auf Grund unzweideutiger und objektiver Kriterien vorgenommen werden,

(*b*) die mehr und mehr begrenzte Kenntnis klassischer Sprachen berücksichtigt wird und etymologisch-philologische Gründe in geringerem Unfang herangezogen werden,

(c) durch Beschränkung der Zulässigkeit der Emendierung nomenklatorische Stabilität in grösserem Umfang gewährleister wird.

Es wird daher im Auftrag des 13. Internationalen Kongr. f. Zoologie, Paris 1948, zur Entscheidung auf dem 14. Kongress in Kopenhagen, 1953, die folgende Kompromissfassung für den Art. 19 vorgeschlagen.

(1) Die im Art. 19 verwendeten Termini haben eine objektive Definition zu erhalten.

(2) (a) Die Neufassung enthält eine Erklärung, dass die ursprüng liche Schreibweise der Namen beizubehalten ist, wenn sie nicht eine fehlerhafte Umschreibung oder einen orthographischen Fehler enthält.

(b) Sie hat eine Bestimmung über die Klasse von Namen zu enthalten, die automatischer Emendierung unterliegen, wenn solche Fehler verliegen.

(c) Sie regelt die Behandlung von Namen, die vor der Inkraftsetzung des revidierten Artikels 19 verwendet wurden, auf die aber Abs. b nicht zutrifft.

(3) Die Neufassung regelt die Behandlung von Namen, die nach Einsetzen der Gültigkeit des revidierten Art. 19 emendient werden sollen. Automatische Emendierung soll erfolgen.

(a) wenn der wissenschaftliche Name einem klassischen Namen entspricht (z.B. appolo für Apollo), und
Wenn es sich um den Namen eines Ortes handelt, der in den klassischen Sprachen verwendet wurde.

(b) Handelt es sich um Namen von modernen Örtlichkeiten, die innerhalb von 12 Monaten im gleichen Bande wie die Veröffentlichung, korrigiert wurden, wobei aber die Korrektur inkorrekt war, soll die Internationale Kommission für zoologische Nomenklatur (im folgenden kurz als I.K. bezeichnet) entscheiden, ob Originalschreibweise oder Kerrektur gültig sein soll, oder ob in anderer Form emendiert wird.

(c) Automatische Emendierung erfolgt auch dort, wo nach Inkraftsetzung der neuen Fassung ein Name gebildet wurde, der auf der Latinisierung eines Wortes basiert, das *nicht aus einer der klassischen* Sprachen, aber aus *einer der in den* " *Ratschlagen* " *angeführten* Sprachen stammt, wenn die dort angegebenen Regeln nicht beachtet wurden.

(4) Ist vor Inkraftsetzung des revidierten Artikels **19** eine *Emendierung erfolgt, die nicht 5a-c betrifft,* aber ebenfalls auf falscher Unsehreibung oder orthographischen Fehler zurückgeht, soll die I.K. auf Antrag von Spezialisten entscheiden, ob die Emendation gültig sein soll.

(5) Der künftige Art. **19** soll bestimmen, *dassalle nichtin* 3 *genannten* (also die der automatischen Namen *ausschlieslich von der I.K.* auf Antrag der Spezialisten emendiert werden können.

(6) Der neue Art. **19** hat die Bestimmung zu enthalten, dass die I.K. in den Fällen von 3b, 4 und 5 das *gleiche Verfahren* wie bei der Behandlung von Anträgen der Spezialisten auf *Gebrauch ihrer Vollmachten* anzuwenden habe : *Veröffentlichung* der Anträge und *Entscheidung auf Grund der* ihr daraufhin von den Spezialisten etc. zugegangenen *Informationen.* Dabei soll weniger Rücksicht auf etymologisch-philologische Erwägungen, mehr auf den herrschenden Gebrauch und die Erzielung nomenklatorischer Stabilität genommen werden.

(7) Als " Ratschlag " ist einsufügen, dass *keine gegenwärtig gebräuchliche* Emendation, die mach dem revidierten Artikel zu Gunsten der Originalschreibweise aufzugeben ist, verworfen werde, bis eine Entscheidung der I.K.erfolgt ist.

(8) Wo eine *unrichtige Emendation* erfolgte, die von den Spezialisten *akzeptiert* wurde, sell die I.K. ermächtigt werden, nach dem in 6 genannten Verfahren die unrichtige Emendation als *gültig* anzuschen.

(9) Als " Ratschlag " wird empfohlen, dass der *Autor* eines neuen Namens dessen *Ursprung angibt* oder erklärt, dasses sich um eine willkürliche Wortbildung handelt, bei Artnamen, ob es sich um ein Substantiv im Nominativ oder ein Adjektiv handelt.

(10) Es ist eine Bestimmung einzufügen, durch die die I.K. ermächtigt wird, bei der Behandlung eine Antrages auf Emendie rung eines Artnamens die Entscheidung zu traffen, dass die *Regelung der Schreibweise* auch *auf den gleichen Namen in anderen taxonomischen Einheiten* anzuwenden ist (um Wiederholungen zu vermeiden).

(11) E soll bestimmt werden, dass Emendationen, die bereits in " *Opinions* " order durch Einsetzung in die " *Offizielle Liste* " vor Inkraftsetzung der Neufassung bestätigt wurden, ihre *Gültigkeit behalten*.

(12) Der jetzige Artikel **19** und die provisorischen Anordnungen des Pariser Kongresses, 1948, sind mit Inkraftsetzung der Neufassung zu widerrufen.

(13) Um das neue Gesetz der Emendation mit dem der Homonymie in Einklang zu bringen, werde angeordnet, dass

(*a*) die *gültige* Emendation die *Originalschreibweiss* ersetzt, deren *Publikationedatum* und *Autorschaft erhalten* bleibt.

(*b*) bei einer *ungültign* Emendation diese als *selbstünständige-veröffentlichter Name* angeschen wird, der Priorität vom Tatum der Veröffentlichung an besitzt und desser Autoschaft seinem Schöpfer sugeschrieben wird und als Ersatzname zur Verfügung steht (wenn nicht die Anderung so unerheblich ist, dass die Emendation ein Homonym zur Originalschrebweise ist). Jeder spätere Gebrauch eines solchen Namens für eine andere taxonomische Einheit ist als Homonym anzusehen.

(*c*) *Fehlarhafte Schreibweise* einer Emendation hat *keinen Status* in der Nomenklatur, kann die ursprüngliche Schreibweise nie ersetzen und keine spätere Verwendung des Namens praeokkupieren.

(*d*) Fehlerhafte Originalschreibweise besitzt ebenfalls keinen Status in der Nomenklatur.

(14) Im Zusammenhang mit dem Gesetz der Emendation sollen Bestimmungen aufgenommen werden

(*a*) für Fälle, bei denen mehrere Emendationen eines Namens vorliegan; hier ist das *Prioritätsprinzip* anzuwenden,

(*b*) für eine Festlegung des Verfahrens für Wahl des *Bindevokals* zwischen den beiden Elementen eines zusammengesetzten Namens,

(*c*) für die Bildung adjektivischer Namen auf Basis von Ortsbezeichnungen, bei denen die Endung " -ensis " verwendet wird (" -ensis " oder " -iensis ").

DOCUMENT 5/21

By **LEO SHELJUZHKO**

(*Zoologische Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, München, Germany*)

(Statement dated 16th May, 1952 communicated by Professor E. M. Hering)

(Editorial Note : For an explanation of the number cited by Dr. Sheljuzhko in the following communication see the document by Professor E. M. Hering annexed to the communication received from Dr. Haltenorth (Document 5/20) .)

STELLUNGSNAHME ZU DEN PROBLEMEN DER ZOOLOGISCHEN NOMENKLATUR

Art. **19.** Es wäre wohl anzunehmen, dass es für Zwecke der Nomenklatur bei der Schreibweise der Namen einzig und allein auf die Stabilität ankommt und nicht darauf, ob ein Name grammatikalisch richtig order falsch gerchrieben ist. Die einzige Möglichkeit die erwünschte Stabilität zu erreichen, besteht, meiner Ansicht nach, darin, *in jedem Fall* die ursprüngliche Schreibweise der Namen beizubehalten und jede automatische Emendierung derselben zu untersagen. Nur in Fällen, wo ein unzweideutiger Druck—oder Schreibfehler besteht, könnte den Spezialisten die Möglichkeit gegeben werden, bei der INK einen Antrage einer Korrektur solch eines Fehlers zu stellen. Dabei hätte die INK das Recht, die vorgeschlagene Korrektur zu akzeptieren oder zu verwerfen (im letzteren Falle wäre der Name als eine willkürliche Wortbildung anzusprechen). Bis zur Entscheidung der INK bleibt jedenfalls die ursprüngliche Schreibweise gültig und massgebend.

DOCUMENT 5/22

By **W. J. ARKELL,** M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.

(*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge*)

Extract from a letter dated 23rd May, 1952

I have read with admiration your most thorough and clear papers in the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7, parts 1–6.

. . . . On Z.N.(S.)356 (Article 19), I have no comments, and I should be content to see these . . . go through as expounded in your papers.

DOCUMENT 5/23

By **J. R. DYMOND**

(*University of Toronto, Department of Zoology, Toronto, Canada*)

Statement received on 27th May, 1952

I approve the suggestions for the clarification of the Law of Emendation and for the restriction of the scope of that Law put forward in Volume 7, parts 1 and 2 of the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*

I consider that provision for the minimum number of changes in present usage should weigh strongly in considering the modifications to be made in any of the *Règles*. I agree that the present trend of opinion among zoologists is in the direction of a greater desire for stability in nomenclature.

DOCUMENT 5/24

By **ERICH M. HERING**

(*Abteilungsleiter am Zoologischem Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*)

Statement received on 7th June, 1952

STELLUNGNAHME ZU DEM FÜR DIE NAUFASSUNG DER " RÈGLES VORGESEHENEN " GESETZ DER EMENDATION "

Der Stab der Zoologen am Zoologischen Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin unterstützt die in *Bull. zool. Nomencl* : 7 (1/2), 9–60 ausgeführten Vorschläge mit 13 von 14 Stimmen mit den folgenden *Ausnahmen* :

(1) Para. 21 (l.c., pp. 23–24) : Für den Vorschlag stimmen 3, *dagegen* 11.

(2) Para. 54 (l.c., p. 51) : 12 von 14 stimmen für die Endung-ensis.

(3) Para. 52. Zur Frage des Bindevokals wird keine Stellung = genommen, bis ein philologisches Gutachten vorliegt.

Völlig einverstanden mit den Vorschlägen (l.c., pp. 9–60) sind nach Mitteilung von Dr. Walter Forster von der Zoologischen Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, München, 11 vor 12 befragten Zoologen des Museums München.

DOCUMENT 5/25

By **HENNING LEMCHE**

(*Universitetets Zoologiska Museum, Copenhagen*)

Letter dated 14th June, 1952

Having now finished the reading of the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 1–60, I want to make some comments that seems to me very important.

First, I have to tell you that I am very much impressed by the amount of labour, skill and interest you have laid down in your analysis, and I feel that you have added substantially to our understanding of the difficulties facing us. It is so much more important for me to emphasize this positive aspect as, although I hate to do it, I have to make some very severe criticisms of the means you have chosen. In fact, I feel that my criticism could not have been given any positive proposals of value without the foundation laid down by you, and so I hope that you will feel my deep appreciation of your work behind all differences of opinion.

There are two kinds of clarity. (*a*) the lucid and short one, making the essential thing easily understood, even at the risk of missing some detail. (*b*) the profound one trying to take everything into account, even at the risk of being complicate.

In Paris, I am fairly sure, nearly every professional zoologist aimed at (*a*), whereas it now seems to appear that you were aiming at (*b*). But (*b*) will afford specially trained " lawyers " to interpret the Rules (or " Laws ", as you have started to call them). But zoologists are not interested in judicial matters. We want " simple, clear-cut Rules " which can be interpreted by a glance. This so much more, as many zoologists are not sufficiently familiar with the English language to understand intricate formulations. *E.g.*, although I have now been speaking English nearly every day in a year, on top of my earlier knowledge, I still used more than half an hour to find the meaning of the sentence *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 55 (3) (*b*). No normal zoologist would have that patience. Seriously, I am convinced that if we make such Rules at the Congress in Copenhagen, *we* (*and the Rules*) *will immediately fall into such a disrespect as to loose every influence on the future fate of zoological nomenclature.*

To be positive—and this is what is needed—let me put forward a set of Rules that to me appears appropriate for all the matters concerned in your propositions of paragraph 56 (1–11). The only alterations* are those necessary to fit in with a difference in opinion as to the number of cases to be laid before the Commission.

---

* In the meaning.

> " The original spelling of a scientific name is to be maintained, with the following exceptions :
>
> (*a*) If a name is based on the name of a Personage of Classical Greek or Roman Antiquity (deity or human) or is a name of a place in the ancient world, any error of transliteration or a spelling mistake is to be automatically corrected—again with the exception that if that name has been generally accepted in the case in question for more than 50 years in its incorrect form, this last form is to be maintained.
>
> (*b*) A spelling mistake is validly corrected if that mistake is—within a period of a year after its publication—expressly corrected by a corrigendum or similar note by the author or editor in the same periodical or volume in which it was first published.
>
> (*c*) The Commission has the power to set aside separately in any single case the prescriptions of all the Rules given in this paragraph."

Let me add that I regard your clear definitions of " spelling mistakes " etc. as extremely valuable and worth putting into the Rules as explanatory matters outside the actual Articles themselves.

In the above, no notice has been taken to the problems of names of recent persons etc. that have been under debate at Paris. Of course the above formula is to be changed so as to include all these other parts of the rulings. Having no access to any copy of the new Rules, it is for the moment impossible for me to do that inclusion myself.

DOCUMENT 5/26

By **K. H. L. KEY** (*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Division of Entomology, Canberra, Australia*)

(1) Letter dated 23rd June, 1952

Your letter of 15th March reached me some time ago. I have delayed replying to it until I had had the opportunity to study your paper on emendation of names published in Parts 1/2 of Volume 7 of the *Bulletin*. I have now done this, and can appreciate the great amount of thought and effort that has gone into the preparation of your proposals.

I realise that in your position as Secretary of the Commission your efforts would necessarily be directed towards achieving a compromise between the extreme schools of thought on the subject of emendation. Since I am not subject to any such restriction, and since I consider it desirable that the point of view which I have already put to you in correspondence should be set out in the form of a reasoned statement for consideration in connection with the Fourteenth Congress, I have prepared a criticism of your paper, with an outline of alternative proposals, for publication in the *Bulletin*. Two copies of this paper are herewith attached.

I am sure there is no need for me to emphasise that the criticisms I am making carry no personal element, but are intended purely to promote discussion with a view to assisting in the formulation, ultimately, of provisions of the best possible kind for regulating this aspect of zoological nomenclature.

Enclosure to Dr. K. H. L. Key's letter of 23rd June, 1952

CRITICISM OF MR. FRANCIS HEMMING'S PROPOSALS FOR THE EMENDATION OF ZOOLOGICAL NAMES

By K. H. L. KEY, D.Sc.

(*Division of Entomology, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra*)

In his paper entitled " The Emendation of Zoological Names : An Appeal to Zoologists for Advice " (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7 : 4–60), Mr. Francis Hemming has presented a masterly analysis of the problems involved—an analysis which it would be difficult to fault if all of his premisses could be accepted. It is because I myself am not able to accept all of those premisses, and suspect that there may be other zoologists of like mind, that I join issue with Mr. Hemming in the present contribution.

Examination of Mr. Hemming's Thesis

The first criticism I would make of Mr. Hemming's premisses relates to the distinction he draws between " correction " of names formed in contravention of Articles 14, 15, 16, 18, and 20, and " emendation " of names on the grounds listed in Article 19. I can find no justification for such a distinction. The Code as it stands contains no direct reference to either " correction " or " emendation ". There is no reference to the action that should be taken in regard to names formed in contravention of Articles 14, 15, 16, 18, or 20, nor, in contrast to Mr. Hemming (*loc. cit.*, p. 14), would I interpret Article 19 as giving a clear instruction that a name should be emended if it contains one of the types of errors specified in the Article. Admittedly the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology resolved that words should be inserted in the Code to make it clear that names formed in contravention of Articles 14, 15, 16, 18, or 20 should be automatically corrected (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 68), but that decision does not yet form part of the Code, and should not be allowed to prejudice discussion of the general question of the correction or emendation of names. As regards Article 19, the wording of the Code sets a limit to the range of circumstances in which the original orthography of a name " is to be " preserved. It does not state that when that limit is transgressed the name " is to be " emended. There is a third alternative, which I would consider to be the strict meaning of the Article, namely that, if one of the specified types of error has been made, the zoologist is *relieved of the obligation* to preserve the original orthography.

The problems of emendations or corrections arising from contravention of Articles 14, 15, 16, 18, and 20, and from consideration of Article 19, are thus broadly of the same nature, and in all instances provision has yet to be made in the Code to deal with them. Further, when all these Articles are taken together, the burden placed on the non-classical zoologist and the possibilities of instability being introduced into accepted nomenclature as a result of emendation of names are seen to be much more extensive than if emendations arising from Article 19 alone are considered. For these reasons I consider that the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology should cover the whole field of corrections or emendations and should not recognise the distinction made by Mr. Hemming.

In this connection the first question to be decided is whether emendation is to be permitted at all. Since it would be clearly absurd to have mandatory provisions dealing with the formation of names and not to have mandatory provision for correcting contraventions of those provisions, this question raises the further issue of whether Articles 14, 15, 16, 18, and 20 ought to be mandatory or whether they should be given the force of Recommendations only. I consider that this question, also, should be brought within the field of study of the Fourteenth Congress in connection with the emendation of names. It may be noted that the mandatory provisions proposed by Mr. Hemming for the emendation of " errors of transliteration " are to deal with infringements of provisions for transliteration from the Greek alphabet, and proposed provisions for transliteration from other alphabets, which are to have the force of Recommendations only. It seems very questionable whether such a procedure is admissible.

My second criticism of Mr. Hemming's premisses relates to the principles he has enunciated in section (4) of paragraph 55 (*loc. cit.*, pp. 52–53), and in greater detail in earlier sections of his paper. The theme underlying these principles, and indeed underlying the whole paper, is that the best solution of the problem will be a compromise between two extreme views. These views are not only in clear opposition to each other, but reflect fundamentally different conceptions of the sort of consideration that is relevant to a system of zoological nomenclature. In such circumstances a compromise is apt to lack whatever rationale may have sustained the two opposing views, and even to be worse than either of them. A more profitable approach would seem to be to seek for basic criteria related to the practical aim in view and to test the opposing views by those criteria—in other words, to examine the validity or appropriateness of those views and seek in that way to reach a decision as between them. It is this that I propose to try to do in the present paper.

It seems evident that the only rules that zoologists as a body should require individual zoologists to observe in the course of their work are those which (in the present instance) are essential if zoological nomenclature is to serve its practical purpose, and the disregard of which would lead to confusion and the defeat of that purpose. It is quite wrong for a minority or even a majority of zoologists to attempt to force upon the rest any observances that have merely an aesthetic, traditional, or other similar significance, whose value cannot be demonstrated by rational argument, and on which the widest differences of individual taste and opinion exist. When the position of what I may call the " classicists " is examined in the light of these considerations, they would seem to have no case. Indeed, when one learns that, of all the errors of transliteration or spelling that can be committed, this group of zoologists is most concerned with those that do violence to Personages of ancient Greece or Rome, one is inclined to lose all respect for their viewpoint. A further objection to the admission of such aesthetic considerations as relevant in nomenclature is that they are liable to change (as indeed they have changed), and that a system devised to take account of them at one time may be out of tune with them at a later time.

A third most important criticism of Mr. Hemming's proposals is that, in attempting, in accordance with his aim of producing a compromise scheme, to take into account many conflicting considerations, he has given us a scheme of almost fantastic complexity. It takes him more than fifty pages to discuss the problem, and six pages to summarise the proposals in a form comparable to that in which they would appear as part of the International Code. Even those zoologists who have no knowledge of Latin or Greek would be able to form or emend names " correctly " by reference to suitable texts or by consulting a classical colleague. It is doubtful whether to do that would absorb a greater part of their time than to master the body of law by which, under these proposals, they would be enabled largely to avoid the necessity. On the other hand, a zoologist with an adequate knowledge of the classical languages would have to do a great deal of work that was formerly unnecessary. Further, the majority of emendations sanctioned by the proposals would be made by the International Commission, to which application would have to be made, and which would advertise the proposed emendation and wait upon advice from interested specialists. All this would involve considerable trouble and delay.

As against the above criticisms of Mr. Hemming's proposals, one can only commend the safeguards he introduces to prevent confusion and instability from arising through the rejection by individual zoologists of emendations already published which did not conform to the rules of emendation as proposed.

Alternative Proposals

I consider that the following outline proposals should provide a satisfactory basis for the drafting of provisions governing name formation and emendation which will safeguard all the essential needs of a system of nomenclature, will make for stability in nomenclature, will be simple to apply, and will preserve to the greatest possible extent the freedom of the individual zoologist and the principle of priority.

(*a*) *Rules for the Formation of Names*

The important points for such rules to cover are (1) use of the Latin alphabet, without any diacritic marks (which are not used in Latin), (2) capitalisation of the initial letter of the generic name and non-capitalisation of trivial names, (3) a generic or trivial name to consist of more than one letter. If such rules were adopted, Articles 3, 14, 16, and 20 would be discarded, but the substance of the first three of these could be retained in the form of " Recommendations ". The latter part of Article 8 and the first clause of Article 13 would similarly be discarded. Simple rules of this kind would remove all problems of spelling and transliteration and of the grammar and etymology of the Latin and Greek languages from the path of the zoologist with no knowledge of, or interest in, the classics, who wishes to form a scientific name. They would also at one sweep almost completely remove the problem of emendation. At the same time, especially if appropriate Recommendations were included in the Code along the lines of the present Articles 3, 14, 16, and 20, such rules would not, at any rate in the foreseeable future, result in any appreciable change in the formation or general appearance of scientific names, because most zoologists would still prefer to use Latin or Latinised names and would form them " correctly ". It should be borne in mind that Article 3 already allows names consisting of completely arbitrary combinations of letters and with not the slightest resemblance to Latin or Greek words to be used, at any rate if the generic and specific names are regarded as neuter nouns in apposition. The Code would also allow of the formation of arbitrary names deliberately constructed so as to differ from Latin words by, say, a single letter, and these would escape emendation even under Mr. Hemming's scheme, provided that the author stated that they were arbitrary combinations of letters. Indeed, in spite of Article 3, it cannot be claimed that in any real sense Latin is the basis of zoological nomenclature, and it is therefore futile to incur all the inconveniences of permitting emendation on the grounds of the mis-spelling or faulty transliteration of Latin or Greek words or on any similar grounds of a philological or etymological nature.

(*b*) *Rules for Emendation of Names*

Given that the rules for the formation of names are restricted to those indicated under (*a*) above, the only rules needed to govern emendation are (1) that the original orthography of any name formed in conformity with those rules is to be preserved, and (2) that any name contravening those rules is to be automatically altered to the extent necessary to comply with them, the altered version being ascribed to the original author, dating for purposes of priority from the date of the original publication, and being protected under rule (1) above as though it were the original orthography. A rule such as that proposed by Mr. Hemming would be needed to deal with cases where more than one orthography is employed in the original publication. These rules would dispose of the problem of Article 19, and would subsume Articles 32 and 33.

(*c*) "*Recommendations*"

Recommendations with no mandatory force could be inserted in the Code to deal with all the matters considered important on aesthetic, philological, or traditional grounds by the "classicists". In that form they would not constitute an unjustifiable imposition on non-classical zoologists, and they would raise no question of emendation.

(*d*) *Closely similar names and Homonymy*

A problem related to that of the formation and emendation of names is the problem represented by Article 35, which requires that specific names of the same origin and meaning should be considered homonyms if they are distinguished only by certain specified minor differences of spelling. The words "of the same origin and meaning" give the clue to the motive behind this provision. If its purpose were merely to prevent the possibility of confusion between closely similar names differing, say, by a single letter, the words referred to would not have been included and the scope of the provision would have been greatly extended. Clearly the purpose of the provision is connected with the preoccupation of the classicist with the etymology of zoological names. Otherwise there would be no grounds for regarding "microdon" and "mikrodon" as homonyms, and "microdon" and "macrodon" as distinct. This provision of Article 35 bristles with difficulties, as may be seen from the discussion of it at the time of the Thirteenth International Congress and from a recent proposal of Dr. Muir-Wood (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 6 : 90–94). It has given rise to much confusion and burdened zoologists with much unnecessary work. Yet its retention is not justified by any consideration related to the practical requirements of zoological nomenclature. I therefore propose that it be scrapped as a mandatory provision and that a rule be substituted providing that any difference in spelling between two names shall be evidence of the distinctness of those names for all purposes. The problems of names differing in diacritic marks, as raised by Dr. Muir-Wood (*loc. cit.*) is disposed of by the provision already proposed that diacritic marks be disallowed in forming scientific names.

The rules proposed in outline under (*a*) to (*d*) above would, if acceptable to zoologists, need to be carefully drafted and properly integrated with the rest of the Code. In most cases provision would also need to be made for dealing with names, emendations, and homonymies established before the new rules came into effect. This should not present any great difficulty.

The advantage of the present proposals is that they would enormously simplify many aspects of zoological nomenclature. The International Code is complicated already. Decisions reached by the Thirteenth International Congress, and proposals such as those of Mr. Hemming that have yet to go before Congress, will increase its length and complexity by several times. It is most undesirable that zoologists should be required to occupy their time in the sterile legalistic tasks imposed by provisions of the Code that have no *raison d'être* in the practical needs of an effective system of zoological nomenclature.

(2) Extract from a letter dated 4th September, 1952

Thank you for your letter, reference Z.N.(S.) 356 of 6th August.

It is perfectly true that I did not deal as explicitly as I should have done with the question of emendations already published. I did hint at the provisions that I thought should govern this aspect in the second paragraph on p. 5 of my MS., and again in the second paragraph on p. 8. My attitude is one of full approval for your own proposed solution of the problem, modified as might be necessary to fit in with my proposals. That is, I consider that the guiding principle should be the minimum disturbance of accepted practice, and that provision should therefore be made for the retention of emendations already published which have gained wide acceptance. I do not think that I need to modify my paper to make this clear, but I would be grateful if you would explain my attitude when the matter comes to be discussed at the Fourteenth Congress. I would also like to emphasise the point I have made in the first sentence of para. 2 on p. 8.*

---

* The paragraph here referred to is the last paragraph but one of Dr. Key's paper.

DOCUMENT 5/27

By **JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr.** (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

Statement received on 24th June, 1952

Rules should be so simple that anyone can understand them and that everyone will interpret them the same way. They should also be so simple that they can easily be memorized in principle so that it will not be necessary to consult the rule book whenever a decision must be made.

In practice it is quite impossible to foresee all the situations that may arise, and consequently impossible to set up a Code that will provide for all contingencies. Even if this were possible the result would be unsatisfactory, since a Code meeting the requirements of this paragraph would not meet those of the preceding one.

It is clear that many names have been badly constructed and would be improved by emendation. It is also clear that many names have been emended in such a way that the original form is preferable. The most satisfactory way to deal with such situations, regardless of the reason for which the emendation was offered, I believe, will be found to be as follows : First, the original form shall be accorded priority under the rules except in those instances in which the Commission, having decided in favor of the emendation, has placed it on the *Official List* and has placed the original form on the *List of Rejected Names.*

This will greatly increase the work of the Commission and delay decisions in many instances ; pending a decision on the part of the Commission an author who has suggested an emendation should be allowed to use the same provided that the following requirements are complied with : he should state that the name which he is using is an emendation ; he should also cite the original form of the name and the bibliographic reference ; and he should state that he has filed an application with the Commission for the confirmation of his emendation.

At the present time the Commission has the authority to suppress one name in favor of another to avoid confusion ; but where the choice lies, not between two separate names but between two different forms of the same name, a rule is needed which will vest the power to make the needed decision in the Commission regardless of other considerations.

Such a procedure is simple and adequate, but it will increase the labor of the Commission. This objection could be met by an increase in personnel of the Commission.

DOCUMENT 5/28

Statement of the views of the Scientific Staff of the

ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM OF ZOOLOGY AND PALEONTOLOGY, TORONTO, CANADA

Enclosure to a letter dated 26th June, 1952, from

Dr. F. A. URQUHART, Director

(For the text of the above letter, see Document 1/39)

EMENDATION OF NAMES (COMMISSION'S REFERENCE Z.N.(S.)356)

We are in agreement with the summary of compromise suggested for the clarification of the Law of Emendation and for the restriction of the scope of that Law as set forth by you in paragraph **56**, page 53 of volume 7, parts 1 and 2.

F. A. URQUHART,

Director,
Royal Ontario Museum of
Zoology and Palaeontology,
Univeristy of Toronto.

DOCUMENT 5/29

Statement of the views of the

COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK

(1) Enclosure to a letter dated 10th July, 1952 from

Dr. John T. Zimmer, Chairman

(For an extract from the above letter, see Document 1/41 (p. 71))

Z.N.(S.)356. EMENDATION OF ZOOLOGICAL NAMES

We believe that a complicated system of emendations under all sorts of conditions would be utterly unworkable. Under the original Article 19, Opinion 4, for example, disallowed an error of classical transcription because the origin of the name was not stated in the original account. This should give a clue to the intent of the original Article and the various proposals to make a variety of changes because of errors of this sort are certain to produce confusion. We believe Article 19 should be preserved intact with clarification by a statement that errors which can be corrected must be evidenced in the original publication. Classical derivations or other origins are not to be taken for granted but must be cited originally to give any basis for changes. Allowable emendations should be considered as full homonyms of the erroneous terms regardless of the extent of difference in spelling.

A.M.N.H. Committee on Nomenclature

(Signed) EDWIN H. COLBERT
JOHN T. NICHOLS
ERNST MAYR
GEORGE H. H. TATE
JOHN T. ZIMMER (*Chairman*)

(2) Extract from a letter dated 6th August, 1952

This brings me to the subject matter of your other letter, concerning emendations. Our Committee deliberately intended to consider as untenable all emendations that were not valid corrections based on evidence in the original accounts. There have been from early times various individuals who took it upon themselves to emend original spellings because of faulty Latin or Greek construction when, for all they knew, the original author preferred the style he had used regardless of its inaccuracy. Fortunately in Ornithology, there appear always to have been enough individuals of the opposite mind who promptly reverted to the original usage and maintained it ; at least there was an early trend toward rejection of the emendations, and established usage is that of the original. If there are cases in other groups where the emendations have been standardised for a long period and there was any sort of confusion entailed in using the original spelling, such names might be taken up by the Commission under its plenary powers ; otherwise I see no reason to continue to reject the originals. If you let down the bars on emendations or place them under elaborate provisions, the result would be most confusing. We are against them.

DOCUMENT 5/30

Statement submitted on behalf of the

NOMENCLATURE DISCUSSION GROUP, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Enclosure to a letter, dated 16th July, 1952 from
Dr. R. E. BLACKWELDER, Secretary

ARTICLE 19 AND THE SUBJECT OF ERRORS AND EMENDATIONS

(Z.N.(S.)356)

A committee of the Nomenclature Discussion Group of Washington studied Articles 19 and 20 and relevant *Opinions*, published a tentative proposal in order to solicit comments, and later revised the proposal (*Science* **106** : 315–316, Oct. 3, 1947 ; *ibid.* **108** : 37–38, July 9, 1948). It was intended to submit this proposal to the International Commission before the Paris Congress, but we apparently neglected to do so in the rush of other business. As a result, the Secretary's report on the subject of Article 19 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 1–60, 1952) referred frequently to the 1947 version, but not to the later and revised one.*

After studying the Secretary's report and restudying our own proposal and the points of difference, we have decided to submit our proposal (with certain revisions) to the Commission, first as a formal substitute proposal in its own right, and secondly as a comment on the various points of the Secretary's proposal. The latter actually agrees with our views in many respects, and the new revisions will also meet some of his criticisms. Our original proposal dealt with both Articles 19 and 20, and we still believe that they should be considered together, but in order to confine the proposal to the field covered by the Secretary's report, we herewith submit only the proposal concerning Article 19 (=Article 20 our revised proposal of 1948). Two copies of the revised proposal are submitted herewith.

In addition to the reactions stated or implied by submission of our proposal (*e.g.*, mandatory correction of the misuse of connective letters is obviously opposed by the wording of Section I, paragraph 1), we wish to record the following :

(*a*) *Approval* of the Secretary's proposal that all emendations formally approved by the Commission's decisions in past *Opinions* be declared *res adjudicata* and fixed, without prejudice to any future plan ;

(*b*) *Opposition* to treating emendations in different ways depending on their date of proposal before or after a revised scheme, because any such plan would be too complex and might involve the Commission in too many cases ;

---

* See Annexe 2.

(*c*) *Approval* of plans to include in the Code schedules for transliteration from the Cyrillic and classical Greek alphabets, and for the use of connective letters, PROVIDED HOWEVER that these schedules be strongly recommended BUT NOT MANDATORY (and therefore infringements, whether by intent or ignorance, would not be emendable).

Annexe 1 to Statement furnished by the Nomenclature Discussion Group

A REVISED PROPOSAL FOR ERRORS AND EMENDATIONS IN THE RULES OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

[Further revised June, 1952]

Article 19

(I) *Original Spellings.* The original orthography of a name is to be preserved unless it can be demonstrated by evidence in the original publication itself that there has occurred an inadvertent error, such as a lapsus or a copyist's or printer's error. The following are not to be construed as errors : incorrect transliteration, misuse of connective letters, and differences between the source and the name resulting from the application of Article 20.

(*a*) When demonstrable in the original publication, such inadvertent errors in original spelling are correctable and are to be treated as if corrected wherever they occur ; the corrected spellings are justified emendations and take the place of the original (erroneous) spellings in all respects, including date and authorship. The erroneous spellings, have no separate status in nomenclature, do not preoccupy, are not available as replacement names, and never acquire validity by citation in synonymy.

(*b*) If an original spelling is suspected or claimed to be erroneous, but there is no proof of error in the original publication itself, the original spelling is not subject to change, even by the original author.

(*c*) If, in the original publication of a name, two or more spellings are used, without compelling evidence as to which is in error, the spelling employed by the first subsequent writer is to be adopted.

(II) *Subsequent Spellings.* In subsequent publications variant spellings may occur either through intention or misadventure. For the purpose of this section emendations are defined as changes that are originally stated to be intentional ; erroneous subsequent spellings are any changes that are not emendations, including those of doubtful status which cannot be demonstrated from their publication to be emendations.

Subsequent variant spellings are :

(*a*) Emendations that are justified under Section I above (see I (*a*)) (valid emendations) ; or (*b*) Emendations that are not justified under Section I above (invalid emendations). Such emendations have status as separately validated names with their own date and author ; they are junior objective synonyms of the name in its original form ; they are available as replacement names ; they preoccupy any later names of the same spellings ; and their authors are those who proposed them as emendations ; or

(*c*) Erroneous subsequent spellings, as defined above. These are correctable and are to be treated as if corrected wherever they occur. They have no separate status in nomenclature, do not preoccupy, are not available as replacement names, and never acquire validity by citation in synonymy.

Example. The generic name *Oxytelus* (Coleoptera) has been written erroneously as *Cxytelus*, *Otytelus*, *Orytelus*, *Oxitelus*, *Oxyletus*, *Oxyteles*, *Oxyteius*, *Oxytelius*, *Oxytellus*, *Oxeotelus*, *Oxytetus*, and *Oyxtelus*. These are all to be corrected and have no separate status.

Example. In 1833 Germer (*Rev. Ent.* **1** : 175) published the name *Dictyophara* (Homoptera). Among the numerous variant spellings of this name that have occurred is the lapsus *Dictyonota* of de Seabra 1930 (*Arq. Secc. Biol. Par.* **1** : 347). This lapsus may have been caused by association with *Dictyonota* Curtis (Hemiptera), with which insect it could not have been confused. The error is to be corrected and has no separate status in nomenclature. Or,

(*d*) Omission or addition of diacritic marks or the substitution for them of standard letters. Wherever these occur, they are not to be treated either as erroneous subsequent spellings or as emendations, but as permissible variations. As in Article 20, elimination of diacritic marks is recommended. Or,

(*e*) Translation of a numerical prefix into an Arabic numeral, or conversely, writing out a number in Latin characters. These are permissible variations, and the two forms are in every way coordinate. Either form pre-occupies the other as well.

Example. *Sexmaculatus* may be written 6-*maculatus* ; 16-*punctatus* may be written *sedecempunctatus* or *sedecem-punctatus*.

Annexe 2 to statement furnished by the Nomenclature Discussion Group

PAPER ENTITLED "A REVISED PROPOSAL FOR ERRORS AND EMENDATIONS IN THE RULES OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE" PREPARED IN 1948 BY A SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION COMMITTEE ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

(Published on 9th July, 1948, in *Science* 108 (No. 2793) : 37–38.)

Suggestions for changes in Articles 19 and 20 of the International Rules, dealing with the formation and spelling of scientific names, was published in *Science* (3rd October, 1947, pp. 315–316) by a sub-committee of the Smithsonian Institution Committee on Zoological Nomenclature.

Comments sent in by readers have resulted in reconsideration of many points and in reorganisation of the proposal in order to eliminate ambiguities and clarify points which had been misunderstood. The revised version is presented as the formal proposal of the Smithsonian Committee. It has been sent to the International Commission in the form of a suggested amendment to the Rules, in order that the Commission might begin consideration of it at the Paris Congress.

Taxonomists are urged to write direct to the Commission, stating their views on these questions either with reference to this proposal or not.

As before, the wording of these proposals has been very carefully studied. Unless otherwise defined, the words must be taken literally in their customary sense and be interpreted strictly. It may be well to emphasize that Article 19 (Revised) deals with the problem of deciding on the spelling of new names *before* their proposal ; Article 20.I. (Revised), with the spelling of a name as first published and the possibility of making subsequent changes in the spelling ; and Article 20.II. (Revised), with subsequent spelling variations as such. The two articles have been reversed in position and number because of the obvious inherent sequence from formation through original publication to subsequent re-use.

Names using numerals (2-*punctatus*, 16-*maculata*) or letter symbols (S-*scriptus*, M-*litterus*) may be held to be invalid under the present Rules, and the subcommittee is inclined to this view. However, the existence in the literature of certain groups of animals of a very considerable number of these names, including many that date from the 10th edition of Linné, seems to make it impracticable to rule them out. We therefore suggest special provision for them as an exception to the general rule that only Latin characters may be used.

Formation and Orthography of Zoological Names.

Article 19.

In forming new names, only Latin letters are to be used, regardless of the characters used in quoting the source from which the name is derived. The Latin letters in this sense are those of the classical Latin alphabet and the Neo-Latin, k, j, and w.

The use of diacritic marks (such as ö, ñ, ø, č and å) in forming names is optional, regardless of use in the source as quoted.

Recommendation : It is strongly recommended that, in forming new names, any diacritic marks be omitted or replaced by standard substitute letters (such as ue for the Germanic ii and aa for the Scandinavian å), as the use of diacritic marks by subsequent workers may be impracticable because of differences in type fonts.

Example. If an author desires to dedicate a genus to the Swedish scientist, Stål, and a species to the Czech scientist, Kříž, he should employ such simple forms as *Stalia* (or *Staalia*) and *krizi* The forms *Stålia* and *křiži*. are not recommended but are not to be rejected on this account.

Example. A name dedicated to Müller may be written *Mulleria*, *Muelleria*, or *Mülleria* at the author's choice or as circumstances dictate. (Note : This requires that Article 35,a and *Opinion* 147,1,a be amended to include words differing only in the use of ue and u, aa and a, or diacritic marks.

Names could be formed with a numerical prefix. The prefix should be the combining form of the Latin word for the cardinal number, written in Latin letters, but if written with an Arabic numeral, the name is not to be rejected on that account.

Example. A ten-spotted animal may be named *X-us decim-maculatus*. The use of *X-us* 10-*maculatus* is permissible but not recommended.

The use of a symbol prefix to show the shape of a marking or structure is not recommended, but, if the symbol is in the form of a Latin letter, such names are not to be rejected.

Example. Letter symbols such as V-*nigrum*, X-*maculatus*, and *C-luteum* are permissible, but ⊥-*signatus*, ∞-*maculata*, ?-*notata*, and Δ-*album* are not acceptable and have no status under the Code.

Article 20.

(I) *Original Spellings.*—The original orthography of a name is to be preserved unless it can be demonstrated by evidence in the original publication itself that there has occurred an inadvertent error, such as a lapsus or a copyist's or printer's error. The following are not to be construed as errors : incorrect transliteration, misuse of connective letters, and differences between the source and the name resulting from the application of Article 20. [See *Opinions* 8, 26, 36, 60, and 70.]

(*a*) When demonstrable in the original publication, such inadvertent errors in original spelling are correctable and are to be treated as if corrected wherever they occur ; the corrected spellings are justified emendations and take the place of the original (erroneous) spellings in all respects, including date and authorship. The erroneous spellings have no status in nomenclature, do not preoccupy, are not available as replacement names, and never acquire validity by citation in synonymy. [See *Opinion* 26.]

(*b*) If an original spelling is suspected or claimed to be erroneous, but there is no proof of error in the original publication itself, the original spelling is not subject to change, even by the original author. [See *Opinion* 34.]

(*c*) If, in the original publication of a name, two or more spellings are used, without compelling evidence as to which is in error, the spelling employed by the first subsequent writer is to be adopted.

(II) *Subsequent Spellings.*—In subsequent publications variant spellings may occur either through intention or misadventure. For the purpose of this section emendations are defined as changes that are originally stated to be intentional ; erroneous subsequent spellings are any changes that are not emendations, including those of doubtful status which cannot be demonstrated from their publication to be emendations.

Subsequent variant spellings are :

(*a*) Emendations that are justified under Section I above see I (*a*)) (Valid Emendations) ; or

(*b*) Emendations that are not justified under Section I above (Invalid Emendations). Such emendations have status as separately validated names with their own date and author ; they are junior objective synonyms of the name in its original form ; they are available as replacement names ; they preoccupy any later names of the same spellings ; and their authors are those who proposed them as emendations. [See *Opinions* 34, 120, 125, and 148 (with supplementary note).] ; or

(*c*) Erroneous Subsequent Spellings, as defined above. These are correctable and are to be treated as if corrected wherever they occur. They have no separate status in nomenclature, do not preoccupy, are not available as replacement names, and never acquire validity by citation in synonymy. [See *Opinion* 29.]

Example. The generic name *Oxytelus* (Coleoptera) has been written erroneously as *Cxytelus*, *Otytelus*, *Orytelus*, *Oxitelus*, *Oxyteles*, *Oxyteius*, *Oxytelius*, *Oxytellus*, *Oxeotelus*, *Oxytetus*, and *Oyxtelus*. These are all to be corrected and have no separate status.

Example. In 1833 Germar (*Rev. Entomol.*, 1, 175) published the name *Dictyophara* (Homoptera). Among the numerous variant spellings of this name that have occurred is the lapsus *Dictyonota* of de Seabra 1930 (*Arq. Secc. Biol. Par.*, 1, 347). This lapsus may have been caused by association with *Dictyonota* Curtis (Hemiptera), with which insect it could not have been confused. The error is to be corrected and has no separate status in nomenclature. Or,

(*d*) Omission or addition of diacritic marks or the substitution for them of standard letters. Wherever these occur, they are not to be treated either as erroneous subsequent spellings or as emendations but as permissible variations. As in Article 20, elimination of diacritic marks is recommended. Or,

(*e*) Translation of a numerical prefix into an Arabic numeral, or conversely, writing out a number in Latin characters. These are permissible variations, and the two forms are in every way coordinate. Either form preoccupies the other as well.

Example. *Sexmaculatus* may be written 6-*maculatus* ; 16-*punctatus* may be written *sedecempunctatus* or *sedecem-punctatus*.

RICHARD E. BLACKWELDER,
J. BROOKES KNIGHT,
CURTIS W. SABROSKY

Washington, D.C.

DOCUMENT 5/31

By **E. RAYMOND HALL**

(*University of Kansas, Department of Zoology, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 22nd July, 1952

Operate on Classical grounds.

DOCUMENT 5/32

Statement submitted on behalf of the

NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY

Letter, dated 24th July, 1952, with enclosures,
from Mr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman.

EMENDATIONS ; Z.N.(S.)356

The Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology recommends the adoption of a primary rule on the subject of emendations, to read as follows:

" The original orthography of a name is to be preserved unless it can be demonstrated in the original publication itself that there has occurred an inadvertent error, such as a lapsus or a copyist's or printer's error."

This is the basic portion of the rule suggested by Blackwelder, Knight, and Sabrosky*. The complete text of their proposal has been published (*Science* Vol. **108**, No. 2793, July 9, 1948 : pages 37–38) and is therefore not repeated here.

Since the views of the various members of the committee may prove helpful to you, a copy of each of the following is enclosed herewith, in duplicate :

(1) Report entitled " The Emendation of Zoological Names ", by Curtis W. Sabrosky (Appendix 1);

(2) Comments received from each member of the committee, on the subject of emendations (Appendix 2).

Further discussion of this subject by two members of this committee (and by other members of the society) is submitted by way of the minutes of a Symposium recently conducted by the Pacific Section of the society. Only that portion of these minutes which deals with emendations is enclosed. A copy of my paper, entitled " Emendation of Zoological Names ", which formed the basis of this discussion, is also enclosed, as well as a copy of Mr. Sabrosky's letter of July 8, 1952, commenting upon that paper.

The material mentioned in the preceding paragraph of this letter does not constitute a part of the committee's report but is submitted by way of a supplement thereto (Appendix 3).

---

* See Document 5/30.

APPENDIX 1 TO MR. FOLLETT'S LETTER OF 24TH JULY, 1952

THE EMENDATION OF ZOOLOGICAL NAMES

By **CURTIS W. SABROSKY**

Secretary Hemming's report on this subject appeared under the Commission's reference number Z.N.(S.)356 in the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7 (pts. 1/2) : 1–60, Feb. 25, 1952. For this unusually long report, there is a summary (pp. 52—59), and the Committee members are referred to that for the general outlines of his proposal. It may also be noted that the proposal deals only with Article 19, for it was decided at the Paris Congress that names incorrectly formed under Articles 14–15, 18 and 20 are to be automatically corrected and do not fall within the province of Article 19.

This is an exceedingly difficult and complex subject and report, but I suspect that there is no need to go into much detail on the various points. Most zoologists will have strong reactions on certain fundamental propositions, and these may determine their approval or disapproval of any given plan.

In general, there are three possible solutions to the problem :

(*a*) The classical approach ;

(*b*) The objective approach (perhaps " objective " is not a happy choice, but it will do for the moment) : Acceptance of the name as published, except for allowing correction of what may be called mechanical errors, *i.e.*, inadvertent errors demonstrable in the original publication, notably inconsistencies between name and text or stated source. The approach is not really " anti-classical ", but a practical approach that can be applied by any taxonomist whether or not he has mastered the classical languages, which most have not ;

(*c*) A compromise plan, using parts of both of the above.

The first approach, at least in the ultra-classical sense, does not seem practical and reasonable at present, and is becoming less so, as the Secretary clearly points out. The choice thus lies between the last two. The Secretary's proposal is a compromise plan as contrasted with the objective-type proposal by Blackwelder, Knight and Sabrosky (*Science* 108 : 37–38, July 9, 1948). The latter is hereinafter referred to for brevity as the BKS proposal. It seems advantageous to make this memo a comparative consideration of the two proposals, rather than merely an analysis of the Secretary's report, because both are complete proposals bearing on the subject, and also because the latter method would have required, in my view, some counter-proposals that were already available in concise form in the BKS proposal. (Note : The Secretary refers in his report to the 1947 version by the BKS sub-committee, but the revised version (1948) was the one intended for the Commission's consideration, and is the one referred to in the following memo.*)

---

* The document here referred to forms Annexe 2 to the statement furnished by the Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, D.C. (Document 5/30, Annexe 2).

The Secretary is fully aware of the trend of the times away from classical knowledge on the part of zoologists, and an increasing impatience with etymological and philological niceties and technicalities, a trend that bids fair to become universal in future generations. Partly for these reasons, and partly to attain greater objectivity, the Secretary is proposing rules that go far in the direction of the BKS suggestions. At the same time, there is a conscious effort to gain support from the classicists by allowing certain emendations. The compromise suggestions, though complex and unwieldy, might work as far as the procedures are concerned ; whether they should be adopted, on grounds of principle or practicality, is another matter.

A general criticism is that the report contains frequent references to the possibility, not mentioned in the BKS proposal, of application to the International Commission. As indicated in my memo on family names, I believe that the right to apply for use of the plenary power in exceptionally awkward, confusing, or complicated cases underlies the entire Code, and can be stated clearly in one place, without frequent repetitions which greatly complicate and lengthen the discussion and the proposed rules.

A second general criticism, as in the report on family names, is that the proposal places too much detail and too many decisions in the hands of the Commission. This might not be too serious if the proposed rules were strict and subject to suspension only at rare intervals. But when the proposals contain loopholes to satisfy various groups of zoologists, the glut of business of the Commission could be appalling. If the Commission undertakes to pass on so many cases of emendations, neotypes, family and related names, etc., besides the flood of requests for ordinary *nomina conservanda*, we may as well say goodbye to efficiency, clarity and simplicity in nomenclature.

It was particularly to take a step in the direction of these last considerations that the BKS sub-committee, after much study and discussion, finally arrived at their published proposal. Their study had, in fact, almost convinced them in the end that the best rule to achieve stability and to avoid endless bickering would be this simple, clear, easily applied and absolutely objective rule : " *The original spelling of a scientific name is to be accepted.*" Even this simple rule needs a few corollaries, however, such as the treatment of alternate spellings (some of them certainly errors) which appear in the same work. And it seemed necessary to provide for correcting the obvious monstrosities that sometimes arise from printer's errors. And so one thing led to another, and finally to the proposal as last drafted (1948), though that was kept as simple and as direct as possible. It may be appropriate to mention here also that the most important and most widely recognised Code in a group of animals whose nomenclature is probably the most stable, the ACU Code for ornithology, adheres to the original spelling except for typographical errors.

The attention of the Committee is also directed to some pertinent and well-phrased remarks by G. Winston Sinclair (1951, *Amer. Midland Nat.* **46** : 252–254). who argues for the retention of the original spelling in most cases.

As a general conclusion, from the practical standpoints of stability, uniformity and objectivity, and the desire to achieve a maximum of automatic nomenclature and a minimum of legalistic procedures. I am personally far more impressed by the arguments of those who are opposed to emendations than by those who favour them. By allowing emendations, we have furthered confusion, with errors in citation, differences of opinion, and variance in practice. As Sinclair (1951) well remarks, the original name " cannot be legislated into non-existence ".

Recommendations

I recommend the following for the Committee's consideration as its recommendation to be passed on to the International Commission :

(1) As a first step in the whole problem, it is recommended that we approve the Secretary's proposals (paragraphs 49, 50) that emendations approved by the Commission in past *Opinions* be declared *res adjudicata* and be fixed, without prejudice to any future plan and without establishing precedent for any principle. Presumably these *Opinions* established usage in the cases covered, and no good would be accomplished by reversing them.

(2) It is recommended that Article 20 (Old Code) be revised concomitantly with Article 19, as was done in the BKS proposal, because certain matters (diacritic marks, numerals, odd letters) are inevitably involved in the problems of both original and subsequent spellings. Article 20 is referred to briefly in paragraph 3 of the Secretary's report on Emendations. Some points have been treated elsewhere (*e.g.*, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**, pts. 7/9, pp. 198–200, 25th May, 1950, on actions of the Paris Congress), but not in direct relation to Article 19.

(3) It is recommended that the Code contain strongly recommended (*but not mandatory*) schedules for transliteration from the classical Greek and Cyrillic alphabets, and schedules or suggestions for the formation of names, endings, use of connective letters, criteria for determining the stem of Greek and Latin nouns and any other similar aids to the taxonomists. This is in line with a ruling of the Paris Congress (cf. paragraph 23 of the report on Emendations).

(4) It is recommended that the final proposal on emendations treat all names on the same basis, regardless of date. The varying treatments outlined by the Secretary for names or emendations before and after the effective date of the plan add a great deal to its complexity, and would contribute much to swamping the Commission with work in the future. In most cases, emendations show little difference in spelling and give rise to little or no confusion. In critical cases, or in cases affecting a whole class of emendation which would involve many names (*e.g.*, the " my " stem that is a problem in names in malacology, mammology and Diptera), an application, suitably supported by evidence, could always be made to the Commission.

(5) Finally, and most important, it is suggested that the Committee recommend the 1948 proposal by BKS, with some alterations as noted below, as a substitute for the Hemming Proposal.

Note : This recommendation is not to be construed as a blanket condemnation of the Secretary's proposal, which actually agrees with and makes use of many of the BKS conclusions on status and definition. Rather, and unlike my paragraph by paragraph recommendations for family names, it seems most practical in this problem to recommend the complete substitute proposal which is available, and then to point out the resemblances and differences.

Comments on BKS and Hemming Proposals

(arranged in order of BKS proposal)

General Notes :

Number : The Article will be referred to here as number 19. BKS(1948) reversed the numbering of Articles 19 and 20, on the grounds of more logical order, but I can see advantages to retaining the original number as a matter of convenience and continuity. I wish that it could be done throughout in revising the Code.

Titles : It is believed that the reader would be aided by insertion of titles for the two sections of the Article, viz.,

(*a*) Section I (Original Spellings),
(*b*) Section II (Subsequent Spellings).

Names of Categories : Certain changes in terminology (but not including definitions) suggested by Secretary Hemming are distinct improvements, as noted under several paragraphs below. It is suggested that the BKS proposal be modified accordingly. The names of the categories may be outlined as follows:

- (*a*) Original Spellings.
    - Valid Original Spellings.
    - Erroneous Original Spellings.
- (*b*) Subsequent Spellings.
    - Emendations :
        - Valid Emendations.
        - Invalid Emendations.
    - Erroneous Subsequent Spellings (see discussion below).

Article 19 (" *Article* 20 " *of BKS* 1948)

Section (*I*) *Original Spellings :* The basic points of controversy lie in the first paragraph.

(x) The BKS proposal would allow emendations, even by the original author himself, only when inadvertent errors " *can be demonstrated in the original publication itself.*" Secretary Hemming agrees with the general purpose but believes the rule should be more objective, and he would limit automatic emendation to cases where the original author (or his editor) corrects the mistake in the same volume, or within twelve months. It was BKS's intention, in using the above quoted statement, to make the basis for emendation as objective as possible by allowing emendations only when the *evidence* of error appeared in the *original publication itself*, without recourse to esoteric information, or private or special knowledge. Another point: Secretary Hemming (par. **37**) regards it as " absolutely illogical and pointless " to include printer's errors as a separate category in Article 19, because they are only one form of " faute d'orthographe ". In the BKS proposal (1948), the expression is not used as a category but as an example of the mechanical or inadvertent errors that are emendable when they can be demonstrated in the original publication (*i.e.*, when it can be demonstrated that some error is present; it is not always possible to say what kind of error it is).

(xx) Under the BKS proposal, incorrect transliteration is not to be construed as an emendable error. In the Hemming proposal, it is in certain types of cases. Two points on the latter proposal: If the trend away from classical knowledge has gone as far and as fast as the Secretary believes, it seems unnecessary now (and will become more so) to make the suggested exceptions; secondly, the exceptions and the varying treatments add complexity (*cf.* my fourth recommendation).

(xxx) Misuse of connective letters is also not construed as an emendable error in the BKS proposal. The Hemming proposal does not include this in the subject of emendations and Article 19, but considers it as an allied problem (*cf.* par. **53**, **54**) to be the subject of a separate Article. I recommend that (1) we express opposition to mandatory articles on the subjects covered in paragraphs **53** and **54**, (2) that we recommend that those subjects be included with strong Recommendations in the various schedules which are listed above in my third recommendation, and (3) that infringements of those schedules be not construed as original spelling errors.

Section (I) (a): Essentially the same in both proposals, but the " no status " provision appears in greater detail in the BKS proposal.

Section (I) (b): Involved in point (x) under Section I above.

Section (I) (c): Essentially the same in both proposals (par. 52).

Section (II) Subsequent Spellings: The two definitions (of " emendations " and " errors ") in the first or general paragraphs are like those of the Hemming proposal except in two points:

(x) Emendations are defined by BKS as " changes that are originally stated to be intentional, or are demonstrably so "; the Hemming proposal would limit them to the changes with stated intention. Perhaps the " demonstrably so " provision is not generally understood, and may be impossible to interpret objectively, and if so it is weak. It was intended to cover such works (probably few in number) as Agassiz, in which there is no specific statement of intention with each emended name but in which the author is well known to have emended extensively and intentionally. It seems best to abandon the " demonstrably so " provision, and to provide in some other manner for such known works that have historically been considered to contain emendations.

(xx) Secretary Hemming's point that the term " error " is too broad in scope seems to me to have general merit. It is true that the BKS proposal said " For the purpose of this section, errors are . . . ", and that was clear enough in its context. But in other discussions, involving both original and subsequent spellings, it would be useful to have distinctive terms for the various kinds of error. Accordingly, I suggest the acceptance of the Secretary's idea that another term is desirable, but I recommend changing his term " erroneous spelling change " to " erroneous subsequent spelling ". The latter term will thus be directly comparable to the term " erroneous original spelling ", and it would avoid the connotation of intent that " change " might have in some sentences.

Section (II) (a), (b), and (c) : The names of the categories should be modified as suggested above in the general notes. The definitions and status of these three categories of the BKS proposal are virtually the same as those of the Hemming proposal. Secretary Hemming does not seem to mention the question of whether errors can acquire validity by citation in synonymy ; this point, which is small, but should be covered, is disposed of in the BKS proposal.

Section II, (c) and (d) : Not clearly covered in the Hemming proposal (though *cf.* references under my second recommendation), but I believe that they should be, and that they should be considered in connection with Article 20.

APPENDIX 2 TO MR. FOLLETT'S LETTER OF 24TH JULY, 1952

COMMENTS RECEIVED BY THE CHAIRMAN FROM MEMBERS OF THE NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY

Enclosure 1 to Appendix 2

Comment by Professor **CHARLES D. MICHENER**

I favour the " BKS " proposal. We are flying in the face of an obvious trend if we insist on too much classical knowledge.

Enclosure 2 to Appendix 2

Comment by Dr. **ROBERT R. MILLER**

(Extract from a letter dated 15th July, 1952)

The more I consider this problem of emendation the more I become convinced that the only simple and practical way out is to accept the original spelling. I would modify this by saying that if it is clear-cut in the original paper that a typographical error has been committed then emendation is in order. I feel this way even though this concept would include the spelling "*Ichthyacus breederi*" despite the fact that ichthyologists of the United States, at least, are well aware that the New York ichthyologist spells his name Breder. From the original publication there is no indication that an error has been committed. My final acceptance of this concept comes after reading the complicated, unwieldy, and impractical proposals suggested by Hemming and the knowledge that, if such proposals are adopted, I will be spending the rest of my systematic life submitting petitions to the International Commission for action. I definitely am against the trend away from "automatic" nomenclature.

I agree entirely with you that objectivity should outweigh all other considerations in attacking nomenclatorial problems.

Enclosure 3 to Appendix 2

Comments by Mr. **CURTIS W. SABROSKY**

(Extract from a letter dated 9th June, 1952)

My recommendations on emendations will constitute my comments for the committees on that subject. I may add, however, that in my fifth recommendation it should probably have been made clear that the proposed substitution was for Article 19 only ("Article 20" of BKS proposal). The Secretary's report dealt with that, and we should not allow consideration of Article 20 (old Code) to interfere with our study of Article 19 proper. My second recommendation and paragraphs (*d*) and (*e*) of Section II of BKS proposal can still stand as they are, however.

Enclosure 4 to Appendix 2

Comment by Professor **HENRY TOWNES**

(Extract from a letter dated 20th May, 1952)

(1) I allow no emendations. No other system is "clear-cut".

Enclosure 5 to Appendix 2

Comment by Professor **JOHN W. WELLS**

(Extract from a letter dated 11th June, 1952)

A. EMENDATION OF ZOOLOGICAL NAMES

I agree with Sabrosky's recommendations completely, and emphasize that it should be made as difficult as possible, if not downright impossible, to emend names in any way for any reason.

Enclosure 6 to Appendix 2

Comments by Dr. **JOHN T. ZIMMER**

356. I disapprove of all the elaborate rules proposed. I believe Article 19 should be preserved intact with a clarifying statement to the effect that mechanical errors that *can* be corrected (not obligatory) must be evidenced in the original publication. Classical derivations and the like, unless definitely stated, are not to be taken for granted. Allowable emendations are to be full homonyms of the erroneous terms.

APPENDIX 3 TO MR. FOLLETT'S LETTER OF 24TH JULY 1952

DISCUSSION IN CONNECTION WITH A SYMPOSIUM ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE ORGANISED IN JULY 1952 BY THE PACIFIC SECTION OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY

Enclosure 1 to Appendix 3

PAPER BY MR. **W. I. FOLLETT** SUBMITTED TO THE SYMPOSIUM ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE HELD BY THE PACIFIC SECTION OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY ON 20TH JUNE, 1952

EMENDATION OF ZOOLOGICAL NAMES

By **W. I. FOLLETT**

In an article entitled " The Emendation of Zoological Names : an Appeal to Zoologists for Advice " published by Mr. Francis Hemming in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 4–60, dated February 25, 1952, the problem of emendation is set forth with great particularity. It may be summarised as follows :

Article 19 of the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature, enacted at the Berlin Congress of 1901, provided that " The original orthography of a name is to be preserved unless an error of transcription, a *lapsus calami*, or a typographical error is evident." [Cf. *Proc. biol. Soc. Wash.*, **39**, 1926 : 80.] This provision has received extremely diverse interpretation.

It is proposed to substitute a provision based upon strictly objective criteria. Such a provision should recognise the recent decline of classical training among zoologists. It should be a compromise scheme, in order to please as many workers as possible. The following scheme is suggested, and its criticism by specialists is requested :

Definitions

Emendations. Any change in the spelling of a previously published scientific name, which the author of that spelling change makes clear is intentional (p. 21, par **17**).

Erroneous spelling changes. Any change in the spelling of a previously published scientific name, other than an emendation (p. 21 par. **17**).

A name that constitutes an " erroneous spelling change " shall possess no status in nomenclature ; shall not be available as a replacement name ; and shall not preoccupy any later use of the name (p. 23, par. **20**).

This rule is subject to the proviso that the International Commission may declare valid a name that constitutes an " erroneous spelling change " (pp. 23–24, par. **21**).

Valid emendations. An emendation made in accordance with any of the methods prescribed for the emending of names (p. 21, par. **18**).

A name that constitutes a " valid emendation " shall replace the original spelling ; shall rank for priority from the date on which the name was originally published in an incorrect form ; and shall be attributed to the original author (pp. 21–22, par. **19**).

Invalid emendations. Any emendation, other than a valid emendation (p. 21, par. **18**).

A name that constitutes an " invalid emendation " shall rank as a separately published name ; shall rank for priority from the date on which it was published ; shall be attributed to the author by whom it was published ; shall be available as a replacement name if sufficiently distinct that it is not a homonym ; and shall render invalid, as a junior homonym, any later use of that name (pp. 21–22, par. **19**).

Erroneous original spellings. The original spelling of a scientific name, when that spelling is later rejected in favour of a valid emendation (p. 21, par. **18**).

A name that constitutes an " erroneous original spelling " shall possess no status in nomenclature (pp. 21–23, par. **19**).

Error of transliterations. Any spelling mistake due to the adoption of an erroneous method of transliterating a word into the Latin alphabet from some other alphabet (p. 47, par. **47**).

Spelling mistakes. Any erroneous spelling, other than an error of transliteration (p. 47, par. **47**).

The Basic Rule

The original spelling of a scientific name is to be maintained, except as follows (p. 47, par. **48**) :

(1) In a name published after a designated date, a transliteration at variance with rules then in existence shall be corrected by subsequent authors. This exception does not apply to names of persons or places (p. 32, par. **29**).

(2) A spelling mistake may be corrected in a note or corrigendum published within 12 months, in the same volume, subject to review by the International Commission. This exception does not apply to errors of transliteration nor to names of persons or places (*cf.* p. 36, lines 1–3) (pp. 34–36, pars. **32–33**).

(3) An error of transliteration or spelling mistake in the name of a person, deity, or place of ancient Greece or Rome shall be corrected by subsequent authors (p. 40–41, par. **39**, Greek personage ; pp. 41–42, par. **41**, Greek place ; p. 41, par. **40**, Roman personage ; p. 42, par. **42**, Roman place).

If there is disagreement as to whether a name falls within one of these categories, the problem of its emendation shall be determined by the International Commission (pp. 42–43, par. **43**).

These are the only exceptions. Any other kind of emendation may be made only by the International Commission. Specifically mentioned in this regard are emendations of the following :

(1) Errors of transliteration, published before a designated date. However, it is recommended that such an emendation, in current use, should not be abandoned pending the Commission's decision (pp. 28–29, par. **26**).

(2) Errors of transliteration in names published before a designated date but not emended before that date (pp. 30–32, pars. **27–28**).

(3) A spelling mistake in a name published after a designated date (pp. 38–39, par. **36**).

(4) An error in a modern place-name, irrespective of its date of publication, and despite any corrigendum published in the same volume (pp. 43–44, par. **44**).

Furthermore, where emendations of spelling mistakes not subject to automatic correction were published before a designated date, such emendations shall be subject to review by the International Commission. However, it is recommended that such an emendation, in current use, should not be abandoned pending the Commission's decision (pp. 36–37, par. **35**).

The temporary rule permitting automatic emendation of spelling mistakes based upon misreading of a label or register, should be reversed, and such emendation should be made only by the International Commission. This was the problem of *Leuciscus hakuensis*, based upon a misreading of the words " Lake Hakone " on a label, as discussed in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**, 1950 : 143 (pp. 44–45, par. **45**).

Supplemental Suggestions

In determining the proper spelling of a name as used for one taxonomic unit, the International Commission may, at the same time, determine the proper spelling of that name as used for other taxonomic units (pp. 45–46, par. **46**).

Emendations recorded in the Commission's *Opinions* and *Official Lists* shall be maintained (pp. 48–49, par. **49**).

Rules establishing the connective vowel to be employed in forming compound trivial names, and rules regarding the use of the letter " i " before the termination " -ensis," are to be considered separately from the subject of emendation (pp. 50–51, pars. **53–54**).

Discussion of Suggested Scheme

The exceptions requiring the automatic emendation of names of personages and places in ancient Greece and Rome were avowedly made as a concession to zoologists trained in the classical languages (p. 41, par. **39**). The advisability of maintaining these exceptions appears extremely doubtful. They are capable of involving serious uncertainties, such as (1) the dates of the beginning and ending of Greek and Roman antiquity, (2) the boundaries of ancient Greece and Rome, and (3) variant spellings. This was impliedly recognised by the proviso that in case of disagreement the problem of emendation should be determined by the International Commission.

Furthermore, it seems questionable whether the majority of zoologists who possess a classical training would be more offended, for example, at seeing the generic name *Lavinia* mis-spelled " *Lavina* " than at seeing the generic name *Adinia* mis-spelled " *Adina* ". Yet one of these mis-spellings would be subject to emendation by subsequent authors while the other apparently would not. The determination of such matters might entail extensive and unprofitable expenditure of time.

In his recently distributed mimeographed paper entitled " The Emendation of Zoological Names," * Dr. Curtis W. Sabrosky suggests three possible solutions to the problem of emendation. One of these he designates " The objective approach," although he expresses doubt as to the propriety of that designation.

I am convinced not only that this expression is exceedingly appropriate, but that the attainment of the highest possible degree of objectivity should outweigh all other considerations in attacking this problem.

For that reason, I doubt the sufficiency of the primary rule thus expressed in the proposal of Blackwelder, Knight, and Sabrosky, as published in *Science*, 108, 9th July, 1948 : 37–38, " The original orthography of a name is to be preserved unless it can be demonstrated in the original publication itself that there has occurred an inadvertent error, such as a lapsus or a copyist's or printer's error."

---

* See Appendix 1 to Mr. Follett's letter of 24th July, 1952.

As so expressed, that rule immediately gives rise to the question, " Demonstrated in whose opinion ? "

For many years, ichthyologists were unanimously of the opinion that the trivial name " *equiselis* " was a typographical error for " *equisetis,*" yet a very old dictionary was eventually found to list both as variant spellings.

The AOU code for ornithology, which retains the original spelling, except for typographical errors, necessarily involves a subjective determination of what constitutes a typographical error.

With these uncertainties in mind, I have as yet found no means of expressing a thoroughly objective rule for the solution of this problem, except as follows :

" The original orthography of a scientific name shall be preserved, unless the International Commission shall emend it."

Such a rule would require a definition of " the original orthography " that would provide for variant spellings in an original description.

This subject is considered in Mr. Hemming's paper, where the suggestion is tendered that if a name as first published was spelled in more than one manner, the spelling that is selected by the first subsequent author who uses the name shall prevail, provided (*a*) the subsequent author is aware that more than one spelling was used, and (*b*) from these he selects one to be the spelling employed (pp. 49–50, par. 52). This is a modified version of the rule of the first reviser which was in effect for more than 40 years.

I realise that this presents an extremely controversial issue, and that a decision either way will be disapproved by many colleagues whom I hold in high esteem.

However, I regard Mr. Hemming's suggestion as objectionable upon the following grounds :

(1) The rule of page precedence has already been substituted for the rule of the first reviser, by enactment of the 1948 Paris Congress. (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 4 (10/12), 1950 : 330).

(2) In the Nomenclature Committee's recent questionnaire, a majority (57 per cent.) of the members of the Society of Systematic Zoology who voted, chose to accept page priority from 1st January, 1954, onward. This percentage includes those who chose to accept page priority as always binding.

(3) In the same questionnaire, 35 per cent. of the members who voted indicated that they had refused to adhere to the rule of the first reviser even when it was in effect.

(4) The suggested rule prevents a determination of the original orthography from the original description.

(5) The suggested rule requires a search of literature that may not be readily available.

(6) The suggested rule inevitably involves a doubt as to whether the *first* subsequent author has in fact been found.

(7) The suggested rule necessitates the subjective determination of what constitutes a " selection " by a subsequent author.

The rule of page, line, and word precedence would therefore seem preferable in determining which of two or more variant spellings is to be regarded as the original orthography.

Perhaps an express corrigendum, published as a portion of the same volume, should outrank position-precedence in establishing the original orthography, although it may be doubted that the question of what constitutes an express corrigendum can always be determined objectively.

In closing, I wish to emphasize Dr. Sabrosky's recommendation " that the final proposal on emendations treat all names on the same basis, regardless of date." I concur heartily with his statement that " varying treatments . . . for names or emendations before and after the effective date of the plan [would] add a great deal to its complexity . . . "

W. I. FOLLETT,
California Academy of Sciences,
San Francisco 18.
18*th June*, 1952.

Enclosure 2 to Appendix 3

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF A SYMPOSIUM ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE HELD BY THE PACIFIC SECTION OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY AT THE OREGON STATE COLLEGE, CORNWALLIS, OREGON, U.S.A. ON FRIDAY, 20TH JUNE, 1952

Symposium : Problems of Nomenclatorial Practice now under consideration by the International Commission. W. I. Follett, presiding.

4. The Reform of Article 19 of the *Règles* Relating to the Conditions in Which Emendations of Scientific Names Should Be Made or Accepted. W. I. Follett, California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco.

Under the chairmanship of Dr. G. F. Ferris, discussion of this paper first centered around Dr. Follett's suggestion that the original orthography be preserved unless emended by the International Commission ; and that, as between variant spellings in an original description, the original orthography should be determined by position-precedence, except (possibly) where an express corrigendum was published as a portion of the same volume.

Dr. Hedgpeth cited a pertinent case among the pectens, and Dr. de Laubenfels mentioned two cases among the sponges. In one of the latter, the variant spellings " *Dusidea* " and " *Dysidea* " occurred in the same paper ; in the other, the spelling " *Hircinia* " was substituted for " *Ircinia* " in a subsequent paper after the lapse of one year.

Mr. Follett believed that a sacrifice of the automatic emendation of " evident " or " demonstrable " errors did not seem too high a price to pay for objectivity, and that he could see no manner in which a rule could be worded to permit automatic emendation in extreme cases without permitting a subjective interpretation of the " evidence " in other cases.

Dr. Usinger stated his preference for a rule that would permit the emendation of an " evident typographical error " without reference to the International Commission, or in the alternative, for the proposal of Blackwelder, Knight, and Sabrosky (mentioned in Mr. Follett's paper) that would permit emendation by subsequent authors if " it can be demonstrated in the original publication itself that there has occurred an inadvertent error, such as a lapsus or a copyist's or printer's error."

Mr. Follett stated that there is a considerable gradation of " obvious " errors, accompanied by varying amounts of " evidence " (direct or circumstantial) in the original description. Toward one end of the series might be placed the trivial name " *hopiknsii*." It was accompanied by " evidence " which " demonstrates " that the species was " named for Timothy Hopkins ". Toward the other end of the series might be placed the trivial name " *lahonton*." It was accompanied by " evidence " which, it has been contended, " demonstrates " that the author intentionally chose the spelling " Lahonton " for Lake Lahontan. But it has also been contended that the accompanying evidence " demonstrates " that the spelling " *Lahonton* " was a lapsus or a copyist's or printer's error. The question which " demonstration " shall prevail appears highly subjective.

Dr. de Laubenfels mentioned two genera named for the same man, in which the name was spelled differently, and he pointed out the difficulty of " demonstrating " that the second spelling was not intentional.

Reverting to " *hopiknsii*," Mr. Follett suggested that to provide for the emendation of a name because it comprises an unpronounceable combination of letters would be to introduce a highly subjective criterion. One of the members concurred, with the remark that the personal surname " Krska " might be regarded by many people as an unpronounceable combination of letters.

Mr. Follett compared the problem of mis-spelled names to that of " inappropriate " names, and read Article 32 of the International Rules, which for many years has provided that " A generic or a specific name, once published, cannot be rejected, even by its author, because of inappropriateness. Examples : Names like *Polyodon*, *Apus*, *albus*, etc., when once published, are not to be rejected because of a claim that they indicate characters contradictory to those possessed by the animals in question." He stated that the trivial name

" *texanus* " was applied to a fish of the great Colorado River, possibly in the mistaken belief that it had been collected in the Colorado River of Texas ; that one of the best-known fishes of North America, the blackbass, has been known for 150 years by the generic name *Micropterus* (meaning " small fin ") because part of a fin of the holotype had been bitten off ; and that both of these " inappropriate " names are in constant use, but seldom evoke comment.

Dr. Usinger asked what should be done with emendations established in the literature—which, in the nomenclature of insects, he estimated at about 1 per cent. of the described forms. Mr. Follett estimated such emendations in the nomenclature of Californian fishes also at about 1 per cent. of the described forms. He suggested that the dislodgment of any one of the established emendations would work no greater hardship than did the dislodgment of the established emendation " *equisetis* " when, after more than a century, it was " demonstrated " that the original orthography (" *equiselis* ") was not a misprint but a variant spelling. He suggested further that this aspect of the problem seemed to present a simple choice between (1) original orthography and (2) usage—and that the question of what constitutes " usage " would seem to be highly subjective.

Dr. Usinger asked whether the definitions of the expressions " erroneous original spelling," etc., as proposed by Hemming (1952 : 21, 47) appeared satisfactory. Mr. Follett replied that he considered them so, except that he concurred with the suggestion of Sabrosky (1952 : 5) that the expression " erroneous spelling change " should be emended to " erroneous subsequent spelling," for the reasons stated by that author.

Dr. Usinger queried whether, under the rule proposed by Mr. Follett, there would be any need for the expression " valid emendation." Mr. Follett suggested that a " valid emendation " would be one effected by the International Commission.

Mr. Follett emphasized the difficulty of expressing an objective test that would determine (1) what constitutes " evidence " (direct or circumstantial) of error in an original description, and (2) whether there is a conflict within that " evidence."

Dr. de Laubenfels moved that Mr. Follett's suggestion that " The original orthography of a scientific name shall be preserved, unless the International Commission shall emend it " be approved by this body. The motion was seconded by Dr. Grace L. Orton. A showing of hands indicated 13 for and 4 against the motion, with one (Mr. Follett) abstaining. A check of SSZ members present, as distinguished from guests and visitors, showed 18.

Dr. Usinger then suggested that the Blackwelder, Knight, and Sabrosky recommendation, cited above, be recorded as the view of the minority. An objection to this was expressed by Mr. Stanley Mulaik, and Dr. John N. Belkin voiced his disapproval of the International Commission as final arbiter in any event.

JOHN S. GARTH,
Provisional Secretary.

Enclosure 3 to Appendix 3

LETTER, DATED 8TH JULY, 1952, from CURTIS W. SABROSKY TO W. I. FOLLETT

Many thanks for your letter of 1st July and enclosed manuscript. I am, of course, much interested in your paper because, as you know, I have spent a good deal of time and thought on that very subject.

I am in full accord with Usinger in desiring automatic correction of obvious errors where the evidence is in the original publication. It has been interesting to me, in view of the efforts by Blackwelder, Knight and myself to get an air-tight and yet a simple wording, that both you and Hemming have criticised our primary rule as being insufficiently objective. By " *demonstrated* in the original publication " we thought we were making it clear that the *evidence* had to be *there*, and not an argument based on private or esoteric information, on guesswork, on probability, or anything else. In our view, one could only *demonstrate* in the original if there was actual evidence there (as in the " *hopiknsii* " example). In order to strengthen the wording, we are proposing to add words to make it read " demonstrated by evidence in, etc. " However, as I pointed out in my memorandum, Blackwelder, Knight and I came to believe that the simplest rule would be to preserve the original spelling in all cases, even as you concluded. But as a practical problem, we did not feel that zoologists would agree to it. If an author states that he is proposing a name to honour Carl von Linné, the great Swedish naturalist and author of " Systema Naturae," but the printed name is *ninnei*, then no rules on earth are going to prevent zoologists from changing it to *linnei*. We might as well face the fact. But, if the name was proposed as *ninnei*, with no indication of origin, then it would be impossible to *demonstrate* in the *original* publication that it should be anything else. As far as anyone could tell it would be an arbitrary combination of letters.

I disagree with your view that the first reviser rule in selecting which of alternate original spellings shall be used, is objectionable. I am an advocate of the third choice under proposition VI of the ballot sent to the SSZ, and to me Hemming's proposal for the treatment of alternate spellings was in one sense an admission of the justice of the first reviser rule : It gives an author a chance to use common sense and judgment, rather than to be mandatorily forced to accept the name which appears first on the page or first in the line. I would agree to using page priority whenever possible, but the existence of the possibility for independent action would be a saving grace.

DOCUMENT 5/33

Statement of the views of the

AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON ENTOMOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Enclosure to a letter dated 28th July, 1952

1. It is recommended that emendations approved by the Commission in past *Opinions* be declared *res adjudicata* and be fixed, without prejudice to any future plan and without establishing precedent for any principle. Presumably these *Opinions* established usage in the cases covered, and no good would be accomplished by reversing them.

2. It is recommended that Article 20 be revised concomitantly with Article 19 because certain matters (diacritic marks, numerals, odd letters) are inevitably involved in the problems of both original and subsequent spellings. Article 20 is referred to briefly in paragraph 3 of the Secretary's report on Emendations. Some points have been treated elsewhere (*e.g.*, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4, pts. 7/9, pp. 198–200, 25th May, 1950, on actions of the Paris Congress), but not in direct relation to Article 19.

3. It is recommended that the Code contain strongly recommended (*but not mandatory*) schedules for transliteration from the classical Greek and Cyrillic alphabets, and schedules or suggestions for the formation of names, endings, use of connective letters, criteria for determining the stem of Greek and Latin nouns, and any other similar aids to the taxonomists. This is in line with a ruling of the Paris Congress (*cf.* paragraph 23 of Mr. Hemming's report on Emendations, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, vol. **7**, p. 25).

4. It is recommended that the final proposal on emendations treat all names on the same basis, regardless of date. Varying treatments for names or emendations before and after the effective date of the plan add a great deal to its complexity, and would contribute much to swamping the Commission with work in the future. In most cases, emendations show little difference in spelling and give rise to little or no confusion. In critical cases, or in cases affecting a whole class of emendation which would involve many names (*e.g.*, the "my" stem that is a problem in names in malacology, mammalogy and Diptera), an application, suitably supported by evidence, could always be made to the Commission.

5. The American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature recommends the following rulings on emendations (modified from those of Blackwelder, Knight, and Sabrosky, 1948, *Science*, 108 : 37–38).

Note by the Secretary : Here followed, in the statement furnished, the proposals drawn up by the Committee. These differ only in a few slight respects from the proposals submitted by the Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, which form Annexe 1 to Document 5/30 and will be found on pp. 130–131 of the present volume. In these circumstances it has been considered that it would be more convenient to readers, if, instead of publishing at this point the full text of the Committee's proposals there were to be published an analysis showing in what respects the proposals submitted by the American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature differ from those submitted by the Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington.

The two proposals discussed above are word for word identical, except in the following respects :—

(1) "*Section I. Original Spellings*" *:* The proposals of the American Committee are textually identical with those of the Nomenclature Discussion Group, except that the former body recommends that at the end of sub-section (*a*) there should be added the reference " (see *Opinion* 26) ", and at the end of sub-section (*b*) the reference " (See *Opinion* 34) ".

(2) "*Section II. Subsequent Spelling*", *Introductory Paragraph :* At the end of the first portion of the second sentence the words " or are demonstrably so " have been added in the Committee's proposals after the words " originally stated to be intentional ".

(3) *Section II, Sub-Section* (*a*) *:* In the Committee's proposals the expression " (valid emendations)", which appears at the end of this Sub-Section in the Discussion Group's proposals, are omitted.

(4) *Section II, Sub-Section* (*b*) *:* The expression " (invalid emendations) " at the end of the first sentence is similarly omitted in the Committee's proposals. In those proposals the next sentence opens with the words " Such invalid emendations ", while in the corresponding sentence in the Discussion Group's proposals the word " invalid " does not appear.

(5) *Section II, Sub-Section* (*c*) : The two " Examples " which appear at the end of this Sub-Section in the Discussion Group's proposals are omitted in those submitted by the Committee.

(6) *Section II, Sub-Section* (*d*) *:* In the proposals submitted by the Committee, the second sentence differs slightly in wording from that in the proposals of the Discussion Group and reads as follows : " Wherever these occur, they are not to be treated either as errors or as emendations but as permissible variations ". The sentence " As in Article 20, elimination of diacritic marks is recommended ", which appears in the Discussion Group's proposals does not appear in those of the Committee.

(7) *Section II, Sub-Section* (*e*) *:* The " Example " which appears at the end of this Sub-Section in the Discussion Group's proposals is omitted in those submitted by the Committee.

(Intl'd.) F. H., 16th May, 1953.

CONTINUATION OF STATEMENT FURNISHED BY THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON ENTOMOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Discussion of I, Original Spellings

The above proposal would allow emendations, even by the original author himself, only when inadvertent errors " can be *demonstrated in the original publication itself*." Secretary Hemming agrees with the general purpose but believes the rule should be more objective, and he would limit automatic emendation to cases where the original author (or his editor) corrects the mistake in the same volume, or within twelve months. It is the intention, in supporting the above statement, to make the basis for emendation as objective as possible by allowing emendations only when the *evidence* of error appeared in the *original publication itself*, without recourse to esoteric information, or private or special knowledge.

Under our proposal, incorrect transliteration is not to be construed as an emendable error. In the Hemming proposal, it is in certain types of cases. If the trend away from classical knowledge has gone as far and as fast as the Secretary believes, it seems unnecessary now (and will become more so) to make the suggested exceptions ; secondly, the exceptions and the varying treatments add much complexity.

Misuse of connective letters is also not construed as an emendable error in the above proposal. The Hemming proposal does not include this in the subject of emendations and Article 19, but considers it as an allied problem (*cf.* pars. 53, 54) to be the subject of a separate article. We oppose any mandatory articles on the subjects covered in paragraphs **53** and **54**, but we recommend that those subjects be included with strong Recommendations in schedules. Infringements of those schedules are not construed as emendable.

Discussion of II, Subsequent Spellings

Emendations are defined above as " changes that are originally stated to be intentional, or are demonstrably so " ; the Hemming proposal would limit them to the changes with stated intention. Perhaps the " demonstrably so " provision is not generally understood and may be impossible to interpret objectively, and if so it is weak. It is intended to cover such works (probably few in number) as Agassiz, in which there is no specific statement of intention with each emended name but in which the author is well known to have emended extensively and intentionally. It may be best to abandon the " demonstrably so " provision, and to provide in some other manner for such known works that have historically been considered to contain emendations.

We recommend changing Mr. Hemming's term " erroneous spelling change " to " erroneous subsequent spelling ". The latter term will thus be directly comparable to the term " erroneous original spelling ", and it would avoid the connotation of intent that " change " might have in some sentences.

Secretary Hemming does not seem to mention the question of whether errors can acquire validity by citation in synonymy ; this point, which is small, but should be covered, is disposed of in our proposal. Likewise, diacritical marks and numerical prefixes are not clearly covered in the Hemming proposal. We believe they should be covered here.

It is further recommended that Article 20 be revised as follows (again modified from Blackwelder, Knight, and Sabrosky).

Article 20.

(*a*) In forming new names, only Latin letters are to be used, regardless of the characters used in quoting the source from which the name is derived. The Latin letters in this sense are those of the classical Latin alphabet and the neo-Latin k, j, and w.

(*b*) The use of diacritic marks (such as ö, ñ, ø, č, and á) in forming names is optional, regardless of use in the source as quoted.

Recommendation : It is strongly recommended that, in forming new names, any diacritic marks be omitted or replaced by standard substitute letters (such as ue for the Germanic ü and aa for the Scandinavian å), as the use of diacritic marks by subsequent workers may be impracticable because of differences in type fonts.

(*c*) Names may be formed with the numerical prefix. The prefix should be the combining form of the Latin word for the cardinal number, written in Latin letters, but if written with an Arabic numeral, the name is not to be rejected on that account.

(*d*) The use of a symbol prefix to show the shape of a marking or structure is not recommended, but, if the symbol is in the form of a Latin letter, such names are not to be rejected.

American Committee on
Entomological Nomenclature.

CHARLES D. MICHENER,

Secretary.

DOCUMENT 5/34

Statement of the views of the

ENTOMOLOGISCHE GESELLSCHAFT, BASEL

Extract from a letter, dated 30th July, 1952, from

M. HENRY BEURET

EMENDATIONS, BULL. ZOOL. NOMENCL., VOL. 7, PARTS 1/2, PAGES 1–59

Ne voyons rien de spécial à remarquer ; sommes d'accord avec vos deductions et propositions.

DOCUMENT 5/35

By **J. CHESTER BRADLEY** (*Cornell University, Ithaca, U.S.A.*)

Statement received on 2nd August, 1952

COMMENTS ON THE PLAN SUGGESTED BY SECRETARY HEMMING TO GOVERN THE EMENDATION OF ZOOLOGICAL NAMES (REFERENCE Z.N.(S.)356)

The plan is most carefully and logically worked out. With the exception of a few minor points I find it fully satisfactory provided the general course of action that it implements is wise. Let us examine the broader questions involved.

The plan is offered as a compromise between two irreconcilable points of view. The introduction states that the one viewpoint, that of the purists, is rapidly diminishing if not even dying out. We are building, we hope, for a long future. It is not wise to jeopardize the practical working of the *Règles* for the sake of compromise with principles which will be foreign to the viewpoint of that future. Will that be the result of the proposed course of action ?

Since I am expressing personal judgment, it can perhaps be better weighted by others if I explain my own status. I make no claim to being a classicist, and yet as a schoolboy there were many long years in which my one great effort in life was to acquire what my instructors would accept as an adequate knowledge of Greek and of Latin. It grates upon my sensibilities to see zoological names that I perceive to be classically improper, just as it does to read or listen to obvious errors of English, or to perceive any other sort of crudity in persons of whom I should expect better. I was taught zoology by Professor Burt G. Wilder, to whom Darwin made reference in his *Origin of Species*. Dr. Wilder used to post notices to students in Greek, in Latin, and in other languages. Once he was lecturing to us on the garpike, *Lepidosteus*. With great seriousness he said, " Gentlemen, they tell me that we must now say ' *Lepisosteus* ' ; but gentlemen, I would rather say ' damnation ' than to say ' *Lepisosteus* ' ! "

I sympathize with Professor Wilder. I should like to be able to say " *Lepidosteus* ". But the end sought is not worth the penalty if it either prevents harmony among zoologists, or subjects them to an intolerable and impractical degree of searching the etymology of the names that they employ.

We grant to zoologists the right to employ barbarous words; we grant the right to use any arbitrary combination of letters, and these rights are not challenged. Is it not quite illogical to rule that a name that simulates* a classical word or a transcription of one, must be changed if not spelled in accordance with certain rules ?

It would be wise to establish the principle that the decision of the author is normally paramount. As applied to the past, this should be tempered by continuity: we should not dig out original spellings such as "*Lepisosteus*" and "*Orussus*" and force them to supplant established emendations. Here I am quite content with the course proposed by the Secretary—that such cases be referred to the Commission for decision.

As applied to the future, exception to the decision of the original author would better be made only by the Commission, and then only on the grounds of flagrancy.

It is my intent that the two paragaphs preceding should apply to emendations in the broadest sense, as defined by the Secretary in his proposals, inclusive of "spelling change" and "error of transliteration".

It seems appropriate that the *Règles* should call attention to the grave responsibility that rests upon every author proposing a new name, if he intends basing it upon a pre-existing word or words in any (but especially in a classical) language, to form it and if need be to transliterate it, in accordance with the rules that the Romans would have used. It should be made clear that this is a matter of good taste, and one upon which the author's reputation for scholarliness depends. It should be made clear that it is also important in order to avoid giving offence to other zoologists. It would be wise to urge authors who find themselves unacquainted with the classics to consult some classical scholar before venturing to compose a new name, other than an arbitrary combination of letters. It is appropriate that Schedules attached to the *Règles* should give assistance to those who are not classically trained. This help should include not only matters of gender and transliteration but also instruction in how to use a lexicon in order to find a stem, how to compound words and in the use of prefixes and suffixes.

Our responsibilities go no further. The author should have the final power of decision.

At Paris rules were adopted, some provisionally, to provide for automatic correction of certain incorrectly formed names. Among these were:

(1) Names differing from the surname on which they are based.

(2) A name founded on one or more Greek words but incorrectly transliterated.*

(3) Names based on mis-spelt Greek words.

---

* Paragraph 43 provides that if there is disagreement among zoologists as to whether a name was intended to be based on a Classical Personage or classical place-name, the Commission shall decide what is to be done, but no *objective* method and decision is set up. By the same token every instance in the old *Règles* requiring subjective decision could be thrown into an overworked Commission for decision.

(4) Names based on mis-spelt geographic names.
(5) Barbarous words formed as adjectives, but ending in *-ius* or *-ia*.
(6) Names based on barbarous words but incorrectly spelled, including omission of necessary diacritic marks.
(7) A modern patronymic generic name not formed in accordance with the precepts of Art. 8, Recommendation sec. h, headings alpha, beta and gamma.
(8) A trivial name based on a modern surname, on a forename, on a name of antiquity, or on a geographical name when not formed in accordance with certain precepts.

These rules are theoretically excellent, and provide for future authors clear guidance for the formation of new names.

If, as contemplated, we require that they be applied to all names, past and future, the task involved becomes so erroneous that in my judgment zoologists simply will not even attempt to live up to it.*

The derivation of innumerable names is a matter of conjecture and subjective opinion. Even to make certain that they are based on classical words is not possible. Can the Commission give an answer as to what constitutes correct spelling of every classical word ? Homeric Greek differs from Attic, but there is nothing to prevent an author adopting a Homeric form, if he prefers it. Many Latin words occur in the lexicons with variants, which cannot be ruled out ; ex. gr. *larvalis*, or *larvialis*, or *larualis*. A zoologist encountering one of the latter two forms might readily jump to the conclusion that it was a mistake in spelling. The Latin lexicons available to the average zoologist deal with the Latin of the Romans and do not touch the language of the learned of the Middle Ages—yet the latter is not ruled out. Furthermore they give merely clues to the " ancient world of words of whose existence we are aware only upon the authority of the old grammarians and lexicographers." All languages are continually evolving. Latin as a language did not stop at 476 A.D., but it gradually evolved into the neo-Latin dialects the chief and purest of which is modern Tuscan. These are subtleties for the most learned scholars of languages to deal with, not for zoologists.

Paragraph **44** deals with names based on non-classical place-names. It cites examples to show that variation in spelling such names does occur. However, the extent of variation appears to be far under-estimated. Comparison of English, German, French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese and Slavic atlases shows that even the commonest place-names are spelled differently in each, according to the slant of the language of the country in which the atlas is published. Who is to rule which spelling is acceptable and which are to be automatically rejected ? Who will decide between Brasil, Brazil, Brèsil ? Perhaps the answer is " According to the language of the nation that governs the place." But governments change. What was yesterday part of Germany is today Poland, with Slavic place-names. Colonial possessions are especially apt to change hands. What zoologist can keep track of all these things, and have access to all national spellings of place-names that are or have been used ? Conflicting spellings in the same language are frequent, and this especially is so in attempts to phonetically reproduce native names. The Okefinokee Swamp in Georgia has run through a gamut of changes. I have myself named a wasp after a locality close to Ithaca which on the railway schedules appears as Taughannock, but on many maps as Taughanic. The United States Geographic Board is continually ruling on the proper spelling of place-names, but few foreign zoologists have ready access to their findings. Who among thousands of such cases can say that this or that spelling not only *is* wrong but *was* wrong when adopted by an author for a zoological name ?

---

* The decision says " inadvertently transliterated erroneously ". This requires a subjective decision as to whether the author purposely or inadvertently used the spelling that he did—which is another complication.

* Take two provisions alone, those dealing with mis-spelt Greek and barbarous words. Think of the plight of a zoologist with no knowledge of Greek, perhaps even unable to read the Greek alphabet. Before he can use any Greek-based name with confidence, he must first determine what Greek words are involved in the name. In a high percentage of cases this is impossible to accomplish with certainty, even by a classicist. Then he is required to determine whether an error of spelling has been made.

Again : How many zoologists have sufficient linguistic practice in general to determine in the first place that a name is based on a barbarous word, then from what language it has been taken, and finally what is the correct spelling of that word ?

Even names based on those of persons cannot always be so readily settled as would at first appear. It is quite possible to assume that the person involved was quite another than the one the author intended, as has been pointed out recently by Sinclair.

From a practical point of view the important thing is to have a fixed spelling that can be found with ease and used by all alike. I am vividly aware of the desirability of having each name acceptable from the viewpoint of a classical scholar ; but to attempt to enforce that it be so, will bog zoologists in a quagmire from which they cannot extricate themselves. Therefore, although at hasty first thought in Paris I accepted the eight regulations listed above as desirable advances, I now, after much longer and more careful consideration see that they were not, and conclude that :

(1) In all cases in which at the time of the original publication of a name its author neither directly named the word or words from which it was formed, nor gave direct evidence that it was dedicated to a particular person by naming that person, nor that it was based on a particular geographical name by quoting that name, the original spelling shall be accepted as the correct spelling.

(2) By way of compromise with the classicists, I think that most of the practical difficulties to which I have referred would disappear in any case where the original author did or does definitely state the word or words, classic, barbaric, personal or geographic, on which the proposed name is based, quoting them in the original alphabet when not Latin. This however, would only apply in case it be agreed that the spelling

of such word or words adopted by the original author shall be accepted as correct (by reason of giving him the right to choose). If this were done I am inclined to think that I would not object to obligatory spelling correction to the extent of remedying any error of transliteration of the word stated by the author to be the basis of his name, or any error in applying it to them or its or their spelling to the formation of the name.

This conclusion must be further qualified by stating that it is intended to refer only to the types of error that come under the eight provisions previously quoted. It is not suggested that we recede from our position in regard to the necessity of correcting certain other types of error, either those for which it has been provided that the name dates only from when introduced in correct form (ex. gr. a trivial name introduced as an adjective in the genitive) or the other rules for which it has been provided that the name dates from when first introduced in incorrect form (ex. gr. an error of capitalisation, or an adjective trivial name that does not agree in gender number and case with the generic name that it modifies).

The Expression " Erroneous Spelling Change " and certain proposed definitions

The expression " Erroneous spelling change " may cause much confusion because capable of diametrically opposite meanings, which can be demonstrated by insertion of hyphens :

Erroneous—spelling change, meaning a change (presumably a correction) of an erroneous spelling.

Erroneous spelling-change, meaning an erroneous change of spelling.

The more satisfactory expression might be " change of erroneous spelling ". If, however, it is desirable to shorten it to three words, then I believe that the first two should be hyphenated, since not only is the meaning thereby fixed, but because the two words " erroneous spelling " are in effect a compound adjective that jointly modify " change ", and, like any adjective, answers the question " what kind of change ? "

The definitions of " Error of transliteration " and " Spelling mistake " (p. 54) are contradictory, because that of the latter specifically excludes " Error of transliteration ", whereas that of " Error of transliteration " defines it as a kind of " spelling mistake ".

" Emendation " is defined in brief, as any *intentional* change of spelling ; " Erroneous spelling change " is any change in spelling other than an emendation. But since the only change of spelling that is not an emendation (by the definition just quoted) is one that is unintentional, one could only interpret the definition of " erroneous spelling change " to mean " Any *unintentional* change in spelling ".

DOCUMENT 5/36

By **W. E. CHINA,** M.A., D.Sc. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*)

Extract from a letter dated 20th August, 1952

EMENDATIONS (REF. Z.N.(S.)356)

I have read through the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, Vol. **7**, parts 1 and 2 dealing with the emendation of scientific names and in general I am in agreement with your proposals. I particularly agree with you in paragraph **26** (p. 29) lines 9–14. There is still a large number of genera based on Greek words which strictly speaking have been wrongly transliterated. If by automatic regulation all these generic names were changed to the correct transliteration, wholesale changes would have to be made involving even family names. Many generic names ending in *-a* should end in *-um*. Thus *Belostoma* in the BELOSTOMATIDAE (Hemiptera Heteroptera) should strictly speaking be *Belostomum* thereby changing the family name from BELOSTOMATIDAE to BELOSTOMIDAE. Personally I should favour a regulation freezing all generic names wrongly transliterated which had not been emended by a certain date, say the last day of the year in which the next Zoological Congress at Copenhagen, is held.

DOCUMENT 5/37

By **H. B. WHITTINGTON** (*Department of Invertebrate Palaeontology, Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 26th August, 1952

THE EMENDATION OF ZOOLOGICAL NAMES

In the interests of stability I am opposed to any emendation of a published zoological name. I would like to see the first spelling of the new name, be it in the title, abstract, or main body of the paper in which it first appears, regarded as the correct one ; this provision to apply whether or not the name is spelled differently elsewhere, or even everywhere else, in the paper. It is desirable that a zoological name be pronounceable with reasonable ease, and such a provision might give rise to cases in which this was not so, but I do not consider this an insuperable objection. A name is a label for convenience of reference, and emendation of the spelling for the reasons usually advanced seems to me irrelevant to the purpose of the name.

DOCUMENT 5/38

By **OTTO H. HAAS** (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

Letter dated 22nd September, 1952

Having been out west on field work for several months, I had only recently an opportunity to study your elaborate proposals on The Emendation of Zoological Names in vol. 7, pts. 1/2, of the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*

Complying with your invitation, I am hereby submitting the following comments :

(1) I cannot quite agree with your opinion that the phrase " à moins qu'il ne soit évident que ce nom renferme . . . " in Art. 19 of the *Règles* introduces a subjective element. I rather believe that the word " évident ", just as its English equivalent " evident " = " obvious ", indicates that the situation is required to be such as to make it clear *prima facie* and beyond any doubt that a " faute de transcription, d'orthographe ou d'impression " *did* occur, thus not leaving any room for subjective judgment. Thus, the present wording of Art. 19 seems to me to mean essentially, but more emphatically, the same as the word " clearly " in your sentence (p. 17, 3rd to 5th line) : " All names which failed clearly to fall within the provisions . . . ".

The divergence of opinion here pointed out concerns, however, only part of the motivation of your proposals, without in any way affecting these proposals, themselves.

(2) I see no reason why " invalid emendations " should be granted the nomenclatorial status proposed in your paragraph 19 (p. 22). I rather strongly feel that they should not be granted such status any more than " erroneous original spellings ".

(3) I wonder if the expression " Erroneous original spelling ", as proposed in pp. 47 and 54, covers mistakes due to ignorance as well as those due to error. The term " Erroneous or otherwise faulty original spelling " would leave no room for doubt in this respect.

(4) Similarly, " Spelling mistake " should in both these places be defined as " Any erroneous or otherwise faulty spelling, other than . . . ".

(5) In view of the fact that trivial names are often derived from the names of districts, areas, regions, countries, and even continents and oceans, as well as from those of places, it might be advisable to replace " place names " throughout by " geographic names ".

(6) The proposals made in paragraph 42 for the names of places in the Roman World should, I believe, be extended to the Latinized names of modern places, *e.g.*, Berolinum, Londinium, Lugdunum, Lutetia, Vindobona.

(7) In the case, mentioned in paragraph 52, of a divergence between the spelling in the text and that in the legend to a plate, the former, unless *obviously* erroneous or otherwise faulty, should automatically take precedence.

(8) The provision of paragraph 56 (10), should not be restricted to trivial names but be extended to generic ones as well. Thus, a ruling on a generic name would automatically cover also all the generic names formed by adding a prefix like " Eo- ", " Neo- ", " Pro- ", " Epi- ", " Para- ", " Meta- " etc. to the former.

DOCUMENT 5/39

By **HENNING LEMCHE** (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen*)

Letter dated 7th January, 1953

In the *J. Wash. Acad. Sci.*, **42** : 297, published in 1952, I find a footnote by the American malacologist W. K. Emerson concerning the emendation of names, and I think it worth while to draw your attention to it, so that it may form part of the material on which the Commission is to work in Copenhagen this summer. The note runs as follows :—

> The changes in the *Règles* made by the 1948 meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature became effective 1st January, 1951. While the official *Règles* are not at this date in print, it is the author's understanding that under the revised *Règles* emendations of generic names, whether justified or not, preoccupy for the purpose of homonyny, and erroneous emendations are available as junior synonyms in cases where the original names are later rejected. This change creates a rather unfortunate and nearly infeasible system for determining the next available junior synonym in cases of rejected names.

It seems to me that the problem mentioned in the last sentence is sufficiently important to require some consideration.

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

CONTENTS

(continued from front wrapper)

EMENDATION OF ZOOLOGICAL NAMES

List of contributors of communications

	Page
American Committee Entomological Nomenclature	152
American Museum of Natural History, New York	127
Arkell, W. J. (*Cambridge*)	115
Baily, Joshua L., Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)	68, 71, 125
Bonnet, Pierre (*Toulouse*)	65
Bradley, J. Chester (*Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)	157
Caporiacco, *the late* Lodovico di (*Parma, Italy*)	66
China, W. E. (*London*)	162
Dymond, J. R. (*Toronto, Canada*)	115
Emiliani, Cesare (*Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*)	76
Entomologische Gesellschaft, Basel	156
Haas, Otto H. (*New York*)	164
Hall, E. Raymond (*Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*)	135
Haltenorth, Th. (*München*)	111
Hemming, Francis (*London*)	62
Hering, Erich M. (*Berlin*)	116
Holthuis, L. B. (*Leiden, The Netherlands*)	102
Hopkins, G. H. E. (*Tring, Herts, England*)	86
Kevan, D. K. Mc. E. (*Sutton Bonington, Loughborough, England*)	109
Key, K. H. L. (*Canberra, Australia*)	119
Lang, W. D. (*London*)	83
Lemche, Henning (*Copenhagen*)	117, 166
Moore, Raymond C. (*Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*)	63
Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, D.C.	129
Peters, *the late* James L. (*Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*)	82
Richter, Rudolf (*Frankfurt a. Main*)	90
Royal Ontario Museum of Zoology and Palaeontology, Toronto	126
Sheljuzhko, Leo (*München*)	114
Smithsonian Institution Committee on Zoological Nomenclature	67
Society of Systematic Zoology	135
Weller, J. Marvin (*Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*)	84
Whittington, H. B. (*Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*)	163
Wright, C. W. (*London*)	89
Zimmer, John T. (*New York*)	75

Printed in England by METCALFE & COOPER LIMITED, 10-24 Scrutton St., London E C 2

VOLUME 10. Part 6
Pp. 167—198

1st *July*, 1953

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

ROHASED
3 JUL 1953

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Page
Copenhagen Discussions, Case No. 6 : Status of a specific trivial name published as a substitute name but at the same time applied to a particular species or to particular specimens in cases where the species concerned differs from that to which the earlier name is applicable : Documents 167

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1953

Price Twelve Shillings and Sixpence

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (6th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The Officers and Staff of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Part 6 (pp. 167–198) 1st July 1953

CASE No. 6

DOCUMENTS RELEVANT TO THE CONSIDERATION OF THE STATUS TO BE ACCORDED TO A TRIVIAL NAME, WHICH WHEN FIRST PUBLISHED, WAS STATED TO BE A SUBSTITUTE FOR A PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED NAME BUT WAS IN ADDITION APPLIED TO A PARTICULAR SPECIES OR TO PARTICULAR SPECIMENS IN CASES WHERE THE SPECIES CONCERNED DIFFERS FROM THAT TO WHICH THE EARLIER NAME IS APPLICABLE

DOCUMENT 6/1

ORIGIN OF THE PRESENT INVESTIGATION

The present investigation into the status to be accorded to a trivial name which, when first published, was stated to be a substitute for a previously published name but was in addition applied to a particular species or to particular specimens in cases where the species concerned differs from that to which the earlier name is applicable was undertaken in response to a request addressed to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at Paris in July 1948, when, after giving preliminary consideration to applications submitted respectively by Dr. W. J. Arkell (Document

6/3) and Dr. H. E. Hinton (Document 6/4), the International Commission agreed to recommend (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **4** : 499–502) :—

> " that the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to make a thorough study, in consultation with interested specialists, of the problems arising under Article 31 in relation to the identity of the species to which a given specific name applied, where that name was based partly upon specimens and partly upon a description previously published for a nominal species, the name of which or, as the case may be, the name applied to which by a previous author, was rejected by the author of the new name, either because the name so used by the previous author was an unavailable name or because, when originally published, it had been applied to some other species."

2. The foregoing recommendation, with other recommendations, was submitted to, and approved by, the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its Sixth Meeting held on 26th July, 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **5** : 115—116).

DOCUMENT 6/2

GENERAL CONSULTATION WITH SPECIALISTS AND ISSUE OF AN APPEAL FOR ADVICE IN 1953

Editorial Note : Attention was drawn to a review by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of the problems involved in the application of a trivial name which, when first published, was both treated as a substitute for a previously published name and in addition was applied to a particular species or to particular specimens which was published in March, 1952 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **7** : 119–130). This review contained an appeal to specialists to assist in the present investigation by furnishing statements of their views on the action which it was desirable should be taken. It was in response to this appeal that the majority of the documents now submitted was furnished.

The questions asked of specialists in the foregoing paper may be summarised as follows :—

(a) *A name published as a substitute name but based also on a species different from that to which the rejected name applies :*

(1) Should such a name be treated as having been given to a composite species, and the species to which the new trivial name applies be left to selection by the first reviser ? OR

(2) Should the rule be in such a case that two nominal species have been established with identical names, the first that to which the rejected name correctly applies, the second, that to which the description and/or figure(s) apply ? OR

(3) Should the new trivial name be treated as applying automatically to the species bearing the rejected name, irrespective of all other considerations ?

(*b*) *A name which, when published*, *is directly applied to a given species but, in addition, is treated implicitly as being a substitute for a previously published name :*

(1) In such a case, should the only specimens eligible for selection as the lectotype be that specimen or those specimens which the earlier author had described and/or figured in the work cited by the author of the new name ? OR

(2) Should the rule suggested in (1) above be limited to cases where the word of which the new trivial name is composed or on which it is based is the name of the locality in which were obtained the specimens described by the earlier author and referred to be the author of the new name ?

DOCUMENT 6/3

By **W. J. ARKELL**, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. (*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 6th February, 1945

PROPOSALS RELATING TO THE SPECIMEN WHICH SHOULD BE ACCEPTED IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES AS THE TYPE SPECIMEN OF A SPECIES TO WHICH A SUBSTITUTE NAME IS GIVEN

This application arises in connection with new species made in V. Maire, 1938 (Contribution à la connaissance des Cardioceratides, *Mem. Soc. Géol.*

France, N.S., Tome xv, memoire **34**, pp. 1–132, pls. 1–20) but a decision is sought as guidance in all similar cases in which an author designates no type specimens.

2. Maire's new species are of five kinds :—

(*a*) Based on newly-figured specimens only, and called " sp. nov."

(*b*) Based on newly-figured specimens, plus a citation of a previous author's reference and figure(s), and called " sp. nov.", and bearing a name giving no indication which specimen is favoured by Maire as type.

(*c*) Based on newly-figured specimens plus a citation of previous author's reference and figure(s), and called " sp. nov.", but given a new specific name dedicated to the previous author cited : *i.e.*, formed upon his personal name, or upon the name of his locality.

(*d*) Based on newly-figured specimens plus citation of a previous author's reference and figure(s) and called " nom. mut," as well as given a specific name dedicated to the previous author (as in (*c*)).

(*e*) Based on newly-figured specimens plus citation of a previous author's reference and figure(s) and called " nom. mut.", but given a new specific name not dedicated to the previous author or his locality.

3. In the event of Maire's newly-figured specimens being found to differ specifically from those of the previous author cited, the reviser has to select a type for Maire's new name. In any case it is always desirable to do so, since the material often comes from different countries, and differences not considered specific by Maire may eventually turn out to be more important than he supposed and require a revision of the concept of his species.

4. Cases (*a*) and (*b*) cause no difficulty and any figured specimen can be selected as the lectotype by the reviser.

5. Cases (*c*), (*d*), (*e*) are doubtful. In the category (*c*), are *Quenstedtoceras lorioli* Maire (p. 36) sp. nov., *Cardioceras uhligi Maire* (p. 68) sp. nov., *C. douvillei* Maire nov. var. I submit that in these cases the types should be the earlier figures cited, published by de Loriol, Uhlig, and Douvillé respectively, on account of the indication given by the new specific name. In the category (*d*) are *Q. douvillei* Maire (p. 49), *Q. quenstedti* (p. 27), *Q. orbignyi* (p. 13), *Q. sintzowi* (p. 13), *Q weissermeli* (p. 35), *C. bodeni* (p. 118), *C. bukowskii* (p. 64), *C. ilovaiskyi* (p. 79), *C. lahuseni* (p. 66), *C. neumanni* (p. 79), *C. reesidei* (p. 61), all called " nom. mut." All are set out as follows, *e.g.* :—

" *Cardioceras Reesidei* nom. mut.

Pl. VII, figs. 5, 6.

1919 *Cardioceras cordiforme* (Meek & Hayden) J. B. Reeside (pars). Some American Jurassic Ammonites, p. 51, pl. viii, figs. 4–7."

I submit that in these cases the types should be one of the earlier cited figures, published by the authors after whom the species are named ; for two reasons :—(1), for the same reason as under (*c*) above, it is undesirable that (*e.g.* in the case quoted) the type of *C. reesidei*, named after an American author, should be a French specimen ; and (2) because if " nom. mut." has any meaning it is synonymous with nom. nov., and the first mention of a new specific name coupled with nom. nov. is usually interpreted as a new name for an earlier-described species ; in other words, only the name is new, not the species. In category (*e*) are *C. gallicum* Maire (p. 81) nom. mut., and others. I submit that in these cases the types should be chosen from the earlier cited figures, for the same reason as under (*d*) 2 above.

6. Since this application raises a matter of principle which may affect all workers, it seems desirable that a decision should be given as soon as possible. I propose something on the following lines :—

" 1. The terms nom. nov. and nom. mut., in the absence of any type-designation by the author of the new name, shall be taken to indicate that the name only is changed and that the species is therefore the same as that referred to and already described or figured by a previous author. The type specimens are therefore those described or figured by the previous author, notwithstanding any new material figured by the author of the new name."

2. *Recommendation.* When the expressions nom. nov. or nom. mut. are not used but the new specific (or generic) name is based upon the personal name of the previous author whose figures are referred to, or upon his original locality, those previous figures should be selected as types in the absence of any indication to the contrary."

7. As a consequence following upon paragraph 6, it might be useful to add a further " Recommendation " somewhat as follows :—

3. *Recommendation.* In introducing a new specific name for a species believed to be identical with one already figured in the literature but wrongly identified, it is desirable that the terms " nom. nov." or " nom. mut." should be avoided, unless the previous author's figures and descriptions are ideal from the point of view of identification, being, in fact, better than can be supplied from the new material. For similar reasons, a new name should not be formed upon the previous author's personal name or upon the name of the locality where his material was obtained unless it is intended that his figures should represent the types.

DOCUMENT 6/4

By **H. E. HINTON,** Ph.D.
(then of the *British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London,*
now of *Bristol University*)

REQUEST FOR A RULING ON THE INTERPRETATION TO BE GIVEN TO THE NAME "PTINUS TECTUS" BOIELDIEU 1856, A NAME PUBLISHED PARTLY FOR CERTAIN SPECIMENS AND PARTLY AS A SUBSTITUTE NAME FOR A PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED NAME.

Letter dated 6th February, 1945

I would like to have a ruling on the validity of the name *Ptinus tectus* Boieldieu, 1856 (*Ann. Soc. ent. Fr.* (3) **4** : 652) in view of the fact that Brown 1944 (*Canad. Ent.* **76** : 9–10) does not agree with my analysis of the case (1941, *Bull. ent. Res.* **31** (4) : 357–369) which was as follows :—

> " Under the name *Ptinus tectus*, a Tasmanian insect was described by Boieldieu (1956) which is clearly from the description a true *Ptinus* and has subsequently—by comparison with the type (Beare, 1904, *Ent. mon. Mag.* **15** : 4–5)—been shown to be identical with the cosmopolitan insect known under this name. Boieldieu erroneously gives *Ptinus pilosus* White (1846) as a synonym of *Ptinus tectus* Boield., and later states that he is obliged to rename " this species " on account of its being a homonym of *Ptinus pilosus* Muller (1821) Blair (1928) has shown that *P. pilosus* White is not a Ptinid but an Anobiid which belongs in the genus *Dorcatoma.* The description of *P. tectus* was clearly based on a species of *Ptinus* actually examined by Boieldieu but wrongly determined by him as the Anobiid, *Ptinus pulosis* White. Boieldieu in effect did two things : (*a*) described a new species, *Ptinus tectus* [his description on p. 652 begins ' 46. Pt. tectus Mihi '] ; and (*b*) renamed *Ptinus pilosus* White (1846) (nec. *Ptinus pulosus* Muller, 1821) as *Ptinus tectus. P. tectus* Boield. (*a*) is not identical with *P. tectus* Boield. (*b*). The two names are homonymous, therefore *P. tectus* (*b*) over which *P. tectus* (*a*) has place priority must be renamed again. I herewith propose the name *Ptinus pilosellus*, nom. nov. = *Dorcatomo pilosellus.*"

Brown (1929, *Canad. Ent.* **61** : 109) described *Ptinus ocellus*. Hatch (1933, *Bull. Brookylin ent. Soc.* **28** : 200–202) points out that *ocellus* is a synonym of *tectus*. Brown (1940, *Canad. Ent.* **72** : 120) agrees but says that his name must nevertheless be retained, as *P. tectus* is not a valid name. Hinton (1941), as quoted above, sunk *ocellus*. Brown (1944, *Canad. Ent.* **76** : 9–10) says : " Hinton . . . . . rejects the name *ocellus* Brown and insists on applying the name *tectus* Boield. to the present species. This, as I have already pointed out (1940), is contrary to Article 31 of the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature, and the synonymy must stand as given above [*i.e. ocellus* being the correct name]. There is no question of priority concerned in the writings of Boieldieu as is suggested by Hinton."

I would like to know whether Article 31 applies in this case.

DOCUMENT 6/5

By **R. CASEY** (*Geological Museum and Survey, London*)

Letter dated 7th February, 1952

THE APPLICATION TO BE GIVEN TO A TRIVIAL NAME WHICH, WHEN FIRST PUBLISHED, WAS BOTH APPLIED TO A PARTICULAR SPECIES OR TO PARTICULAR SPECIMENS AND ALSO STATED TO BE A SUBSTITUTE NAME FOR SOME PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED TRIVIAL NAME OR IS CLEARLY IMPLIED TO BE SUCH A SUBSTITUTE.

I have read with great interest your paper on the above subject and note therein that specialists are asked to furnish examples of cases in which a specific name, when first published (i) was expressly stated to be a substitute name for some previously published specific name, and (ii) was also accompanied by a description of a given species (or of specimens belonging to a given species) different from that to which the rejected specific name is correctly applicable. Three such cases have come to my notice recently in the course of research in fossil Mollusca ; two are afforded by nominal species proposed by L. W. Collet in 1908 for certain Ammonoidea, and the third concerns the lamellibranch species *Psammobia impar* Zittel, 1865. Consideration of Collet's ammonite species is complicated by special features which make it desirable that the facts relating to these species should be laid before the Commission in a separate communication. The present note therefore deals with the present problem only as it arises in connection with *Psammobia impar*, Zittel This is itself an important case, *Psammobia impar* being the type species, by original designation, of the nominal genus *Icanotia* Stoliczka, 1870 ; it is doubly desirable therefore that there should be no doubt as to the taxonomic species to which the trivial name *impar* correctly applies. The facts of the case are as follows.

Psammobia impar was proposed by Zittel in 1865 as a substitute name for *Capsa elegans* d'Orbigny, 1844, which became a junior homonym of *Solen elegans* Matheron, 1842, on transference of both nominal species to the genus *Psammobia* by Zittel. Simultaneously with its publication the new name *Psammobia impar* was applied by Zittel to specimens from the Gosau formation of Austria, and one such specimen was illustrated as plate ii, figure 4 of Zittel's paper (Zittel, 1865, *Denksch. Akad. Wien*, **24** : 120–21).

The specimen illustrated by Zittel as *Psammobia impar* from the Gosau formation is not conspecific with d'Orbigny's *Capsa elegans*, which was founded upon a specimen from the Cenomanian of Le Mans, France (d'Orbigny, 1844, *Pal. franc.*, Terr. Cret. **3** : 423, pl. 381, figs. 1–2).

The manner in which the name *Psammobia impar* (now *Icanotia impar*) has been applied by subsequent workers is illustrated by the following :

(a) Stoliczka in 1870 proposed *Psammobia impar* Zittel as the type species of a new nominal subgenus (now genus) *Icanotia*, but without qualifying Zittel's name (Stoliczka, 1870, *Pal. indica*, Cret. Fauna S. India, **3** : 145). He figured the hinge of a Gosau specimen under the name *impar* (*ibid.*, pl. 17, fig. 5), but at the same time he appears to have regarded *Psammobia impar* merely as a substitute name for *Capsa elegans* d'Orbigny, for on an earlier page (*ibid* : 122) he had written : " *impar*, Zittel (=*elegans*, d'Orb.)", and in a footnote added : " d'Orbigny's name *elegans* was changed into *impar* by Zittel, who identifies the Gosau with the French species, although, judging from the figures, there are considerable differences between the two."

(b) Zittel in 1895, in his textbook of palaeontology (Grundzüge der Palaeontologie) illustrated *Icanotia impar* by a specimen of the Gosau species. This illustration has been repeated in all the many editions and translations of this well-known text-book.

(c) Dall in 1903, writing of *Icanotia*, added : " Type : *Psammobia impar* Zittel, Gosau (Dall, 1903, Tertiary Fauna Florida : 1324).

(d) Wade in 1926 (U.S. Professional Paper **137** : 91), listing various species of *Icanotia*, quoted as two distinct species (i) *Icanotia impar* (Zittel), Gosau, Austria, and (ii) *Icanotia elegans* (d'Orbigny), Le Mans, France.

In reviewing the above examples, it becomes evident that (1) specialists have long recognised that the name *Psammobia impar* is concerned with two distinct taxonomic entities, *i.e.*, (i) the species from the Cenomanian of France, originally described by d'Orbigny as *Capsa elegans*, and for which Zittel supplied the nominal substitute *Psammobia impar*, and (ii) the Gosau species attributed to *Psammobia impar* by Zittel and of which plate ii, figure 4 of his 1865 paper is illustrative ; and (2) that there has been a tendency on the part of such specialists to restrict the name *impar* to the Gosau species, rather than to the French Cenomanian form for which the name *impar* was clearly proposed as a trivial nominal substitute.

In my opinion, the interpretation placed upon *Icanotia impar* by, for example, Wade (see (d) above) is undesirable. I would advocate that the facts of this case be analysed and interpreted as follows : In 1865 Zittel carried out two independent actions in regard to the subject under discussion ; (1) he supplied a substitute name, *Psammobia impar*, for d'Orbigny's *Capsa elegans*, and (2) he identified certain specimens, from the Gosau formation with the d'Orbigny species, the name of which he had replaced. As an objective fact following automatically upon (1) the nominal species *Psammobia impar* Zittel has for type the original of d'Orbigny's plate 381, figures 1–2, this being the type specimen of *Capsa elegans* d'Orbigny. Determination of the Gosau specimens is a subjective matter ; in assigning them to *Psammobia impar* Zittel was in error ; they belong to a different and as yet unnamed species.

Consideration of the facts relating to *Psammobia impar* shows that, as in the case of *Ptinus tectus*, instanced in your paper, divergent views are held concerning the problem of interpretation of this nominal species ; and clearly a need exists for a rule of general application for the guidance of specialists who may be faced with a problem such as that presented by *Psammobia impar* and *Ptinus tectus*.

From the remarks above concerning *Psammobia impar* I have made it clear that I am in favour of the third of the three interpretations of this problem set out in your paper on the subject. That is to say, I take the view that if a name is unequivocally published as a substitute for some other name, the new name so published should adhere in all circumstances to the taxonomic species to which the rejected name is applicable. I regard it as irrelevant from a nomenclatorial point of view if the author of the new name at the same time erroneously applies that name to a species other than that to which the rejected name is legitimately applicable.

Turning to the questions raised in paragraph 17 of your paper, I wish to state that I am in sympathy with the proposal submitted to the Commission by Dr. Arkell, but I would prefer to see that proposal given expression in the form of a non-mandatory *Recommendation*.

DOCUMENT 6/6

By **G. H. E. HOPKINS**, O.B.E., M.A.

(*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts.*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 25th March, 1952

THE APPLICATION OF A TRIVIAL NAME WHICH, WHEN FIRST PUBLISHED, IS APPLIED TO A PARTICULAR SPECIES OR SPECIMEN, BUT WHICH IS STATED ALSO TO BE A SUBSTITUTE NAME FOR SOME PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED NAME.

When the question of the correct application of a trivial name which, as first published, applied both to material that its author had before him and to material described by an earlier author (for which it is stated to be a substitute name) was discussed at Paris, two views were expressed. Dr. W. J. Arkell considered (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 499) that if the author of the specific name gave an indication " such as the use of the expression ' *nom. nov.*' (or an equivalent expression) or the selection as the basis for the new trivial name either of the personal name of the author to whose work a reference has been given, or of the name of the type locality of the species, which implied that the species thus given a new name was more closely linked to the material to which the cited bibliographical reference applied than to the new material before the author at the time when he published the new name ", then the material the author actually had before him should be excluded from consideration when a lectotype is selected. Dr. H. E. Hinton (*l. c.* : 500) considered that the selection of a lectotype should be governed by page-precedence. Both of these views seem to me to be incorrect, and I am strongly of the opinion that this is not a matter on which the International Commission should make regulations, though it would be appropriate that they should make recommendations.

It seems to me that it is an obvious principle that one must, so far as possible, be governed by what an author did rightly and not by his mistakes. In the type of case under discussion the second has described (presumably accurately) material that he had before him, and misidentified it with the material described by the earlier author ; either the procedure advocated by Dr. Arkell or that recommended by Dr. Hinton might easily mean that we must be guided by the mistake and not by what is correct. Furthermore, any mandatory regulations governing the selection of a lectotype in such cases could easily result in a most undesirable and absurd state of affairs. Let us assume that (at the same time as the second author renames the material that he wrongly thinks to be the species described by the earlier author) he also names and describes a new genus of which he makes it the type species, and that subsequent investigation shows that the two species concerned are not congeneric. Then any mandatory regulations to the effect that the material the second author actually had before him should be excluded from consideration in selecting a lectotype would obviously result (since the generic description would have been drawn up from this excluded material) in the absurdity that the genus would have a type species that did not comply with the generic description, while selection on the principle of page-precedence would make it a matter of chance whether this result would follow or not.

A secondary consideration is that it is usually the case that the later author's description is more diagnostic than that of the earlier author, so that it is commonly far more convenient to regard his material as the type material of the name than that of the earlier author. It is not infrequently the case, if the specimens used by the earlier author are lost, that one can say with some certainty that his species was not that before the second author, but cannot decide with any confidence what it actually was.

I agree with Dr. Arkell in thinking that a geographical name (or, in the case of a parasite, a name based on that of a host) should be considered to be a restriction by the original author of the name in question. But in all other cases I suggest that it is most desirable that the subsequent reviser should be left free to select to bear the name whichever element of the composite nominal species seems best and most convenient. In considering the names given by Linné to Mallophaga, several of which are composite, Miss T. Clay and I (1950, *Bull. Brit. Mus. nat. Hist.*, Entomology **1** : 223–272) have taken the view that, in the absence of any strong reasons to the contrary, all names referring to nominal species that are composite should be restricted to the material actually examined by the author of the name.

Summing up, I strongly deprecate any mandatory provisions being made by the Commission as to the selection of a lectotype in such cases, but I consider that the use by the second author of a name based on the type locality of the species, or the type host of a parasitic species, should be regarded as an original restriction, and I advocate a *Recommandation* that (unless there are strong reasons to the contrary) revisers should select a lectotype in all other instances in such a way that the name will apply to the material the author of the name actually had before him and not to the species which he erroneously thought he had.

DOCUMENT 6/7

By **LESLIE BAIRSTOW**, M.A. (*British Museum (Natural History), Department of Geology, London*)

Letter dated 29th March, 1952

REPLY TO QUESTIONNAIRE, BULL. Z. NOMENCL. 7 : 127–130. Z.N. (S.) 361

Case (a). Paragraph 13.

(1) I cannot recall any instance in dibranchiate cephalopods in which a specific name, when first published, was expressly stated to be a substitute name for some previously published specific name, and was also accompanied by a description of a given species (or of specimens belonging to a given species) different from that to which the rejected specific name is correctly applicable.

It may, however, be of interest to draw attention to a somewhat comparable instance at generic level. Parkinson, 1811 (*Organic Remains of a Former World* **3** : 110) established the generic name *Spirulites*. This name was expressly stated to denominate fossil *Spirula*. Parkinson stated that " The fossil shells of this genus appear to resemble *Spirula fragilis*, Lam. *Nautilis spirulus*, Linn." [*i.e.*, *Spirula spirula* (Linnaeus)] " very closely, except in size " . . . " the fossil shells being so much larger, as almost to warrant a specific distinction founded on this circumstance alone." No other specific name was mentioned, but several specimens of *Spirulites* were figured (pl. VI, fig. 11 and pl. VII, figs. 18, 19). From the figures and the localities stated it seems that the fossil specimens studied by Parkinson do not fall within the limits of the genus *Spirula* as now interpreted. In this instance it seems clearly desirable to regard *Spirulites* Parkinson, 1811, as an objective synonym of *Spirula* Lamarck, 1799 (*Mém. Soc. Hist. nat. Paris* **1799** : 80), even though the specimens to which Parkinson applied the name *Spirulites* are not now regarded as *Spirula*. Neave's Nomenclator recorded *Spirulites* Parkinson, 1811, as " pro *-la* Lamarck 1799 ".

(2) I favour possible ruling (c) : that the new specific name in question is to be treated as applying automatically to the species bearing the rejected name, the other use of the new name being treated as having been due to a misidentification.

Case (b). Paragraph 17.

(1) Yes.

(2) In these circumstances, if the material on which the publications concerned are based includes material from the locality indicated by the new specific name, only this material should be eligible for selection as lectotype

of the new nominal species ; but such material from this locality, even if material published only by the new author, should not be excluded from selection. It is only when the new author's new material does not include, though the earlier author's material does include, material from this locality, that it is implied with adequate force that the new name is indeed intended primarily as a substitute for the earlier name.

DOCUMENT 6/8

By **G. KRUSEMAN** (*Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*)

SUBSTITUTE NAMES (REFERENCE Z.N. (S.) 361)

In connection with your enquiry in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, Vol. 7, Part 4, I am communicating to you that I found an example of the *Ptinus tectus* type.

White renamed *Apis arcticus* Dahlbom 1832 *nec* Kirby 1821 (and *nec* Quensel 1802) *Bombus Smithianus* in connection with the publication of some localities in the Shetland Islands.

Apis arcticus Dahlbom however belongs to *B. agrorum* and was redescribed by me (not knowing that White had already renamed it) from the lectotype as *B. agrorum erlandsoni* Kruseman, 1950.

The specimen of the Shetland Islands are not forms of *B. agrorum*, but of *B. smithianus* auct. (contigent forming with *Bl. muscorum* auct. (*nec.* L.) one super-species). It is clear *B. smithianus* never being used for *B. agrorum erlandsoni* Kruseman, that it would create confusion, if we had to use the name in this sense. The type specimens of *smithianus* are probably in London Brit. Mus.N.H. The lectotype of *Apis arctious* Dahlbom is in Lund.

DOCUMENT 6/9

By Dr. **HALTENORTH** (*Museum, München, Germany*)

Statement, dated 14th May, 1952, communicated by
Professor E. M. HERING

V. B.1 ist verzuziehen.
" D ". Nein.

Explanatory Note

The foregoing comment was prepared by Dr. Haltenorth in response to an invitation by Professor E. M. Hering who had prepared the following synopsis of the problems at issue for consideration by German zoologists. It is to this document that the numbers cited by Dr. Haltenorth refer.

IV. Verwendbarkeit von MS.-Namen als Gattungstypen, wenn der Genusname vor 1931 erstmals in der Synonymie eines anderen Gattungsnamen Veröffentlicht wurde.

A. Bishrige Regelung :

Nach Opinio 4 gewinnt ein MS.-Name nur dann Status in der Nomenklatur, wenn er nach Art. 25 der " Regeln " entsprechend veröffentlicht wurde. Der Kongress Paris 1948 beauftragte die INK. sur untersuchen and zur Entscheidung auf dem Kongress Kopenhagen 1953 vorzulegen die Frage wie die typische Art für ein MS.-Genus festzulegen ist, wenn dieses in der Synonymie eines vorher beschriebenen erstmal veröffentlicht wurde. Dies bzieht sich nur auf die Zeit vor dem 1. 1. 31, da von diesem Datum ab entsprechend der Entscheidung des Kongress Budapest 1927 der erweiterte Art. 25 für die " Kennzeichnung " in Kraft ist.

B. Zwei Ansichten :

1. Ansicht : Ein *MS.-Name ist* ein *nomen nudum* und kann erst dann und von dem Zeitpunkt an nomenklatorischen Status erhalten, wenn er später genuss Art. 25 rite veröffentlicht worden ist.

2. Ansicht : In der *Synonymsetzung ist* eine *gültige Kennzeichnung* gemäss Art. 25 zu sehen.

C. Fragen :

(1) Soll ein vor 1931 in einer Genus-Synonymie erschienener Genusname als rite veröffentlicht gelten ?

Der Kongress hat diese Namen als in der Nomenklatur existent angeschen und will nur die Frage klären, welche Art als Typus des Genus anzusehen.

(2) Dasich die gleiche Problematik auch für die Arten in Synonymielisten ergibt, sollen MS. Gattungen *und Arten* in Synonymien als nomenklatorisch berechtigt angesehen werden.

(3) Ist es *in einer Gruppe üblich* gewesen, dass MS.-Genusnamen oder frühere Nomina nuda akzeptiert wurden, wenn sie erstmals in einer Gattaungs-Synonymie veröffentlicht worden sind ? In welchem Gruppen ?

(4) Wenn ja, ist man dafür, dass diese Annahmen *durch die " Regeln " festgelegt* werden ?

(5) Wenn nein, ist man dafür, dass diese Namen keinen Status in der Nomenklatur erhalten sollen, auch wenn *infolgedessen Instabilitat* eintritt ?

(6) Wenn Genusnamen durch Veröffentlichung in Synonymien Status erhalten, *welches soll dann die typische Art* für diese bisherigen MS.-Genera sein Zwei Möglischkeiten :

(*a*) Typische Art des Genus wird *automatisch* die Art, die *Typus des Genus* ist, in der das MS.-Genus als Synonymie auftritt.

(*b*) *Aus allen* bei der Synonymierung angeführten *Arten* ist der Typus des Genus *auswählbar*, ohne Berücksichtigung der Tatsache, dass für das Genus, zu dem das MS.-Genus synonymgesetat wurde, bereits ein Typus ausgewählt wurde.

Ist eine der beiden Möglichkeiten in einer Grupper schon einmal verwirklicht ? In welcher ?

D. *Sicherangs-Klauseln* müssen in die " Regeln " eingebaut werden, dass durch Anrufung der INK. Ausnahmen vorgenommen werden, *wenn die Stabilität gefürdet* ist.

Welche Vorschrift kann am besten Instabilität verhindern ?

DOCUMENT 6/10

By **C. W. WRIGHT** (*London*)

Enclosure to a letter of 18th May, 1952

SUBSTITUTE NAMES. (Z.N.(S.) 361)

I do not believe that this case is quite so straightforward as it is presented to be.

There are in the literature a large number of cases where trivial names are genuinely proposed as " *nomina nova* " for other trivial names, *e.g.* a new name for a homonym. To deal first with this simple case, I am of the opinion that where " *b-us* " is proposed as a *nomen novum* for an invalid " *a-us* ", whether or not other specimens of the same species (or presumed to be) are figured at the time of the new proposal, the holotype of the new nominal species must be the holotype of the one that is being replaced.

On the other hand the vast majority of trivial names that are established allegedly as *nomina nova* are in fact " new species ". That is, " *b-us* " nov. is not strictly a " nom. nov." for " *a-us* ", whatever its author may say, because " *a-us* " remains a valid species, while " *b-us* " is a new species based, wholly or partly, on specimens misidentified by a previous author as " *a-us* ". Certainly in the field of ammonites there are many instances of trivial names, treated by their authors as *nomina nova*, which are *e.g.* " nom. nov. for *Ammonites a-us* Smith, 1890 non Jones, 1880 ". I imagine that the instances quoted by Dr. Arkell from Maire are of this nature.

Such cases cannot to my thinking be treated in the same way as the simple ones first mentioned. In my own experience there are cases of this type in which the figure of the earlier author whose determination is being corrected is adequate for proper interpretation of the taxonomic species concerned, while the supplementary figure by the author proposing the new name is not. Equally there are cases where the reverse is true and the figure of the later author alone gives an adequate idea of the nature of the new species being set up, although it may be certain or reasonably certain that the species figured by the earlier author is taxonomically the same.

In all such cases it seems to me the provisions of Article 31, as revised, must be allowed to apply. It would be carrying the interests of history too far to insist for example on the selection of type specimen of " *b-us* Smith, 1890 " from poor material figured as " *a-us* " by Jones, 1880 instead of from Smith's admirable material from a different locality, just because the trivial name " *b-us* " referred to Jones or to his locality and was, incorrectly, called " nom. nov."

The same considerations apply to cases where trivial names are published as implicit substitutes for incorrect use of other names.

The use of the earlier author's patronymic for the later author's species is entirely unimportant in view of the large number of irrelevant or now meaningless dedications of species to individuals. There may be some slight confusion due to a case such as the retention of the trivial name *americanus* for a species which is not now thought to occur in America, but many other types of misleading names are rightly treated as valid.

Briefly, where a trivial name is genuinely a *nomen novum*, that is, a replacement name for an invalid trivial name, the type specimen of the new nominal species must be whatever is the type specimen of the nominal species being replaced. Where a trivial name, though stated by its author to be a *nomen novum*, is in fact not a replacement name but the name of a species now newly separated, Article 31 must apply.

DOCUMENT 6/11

By **ERICH M. HERING** (*Abteilungsleiter am Zoologischen Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*)

Statement received on 7th June, 1952

STELLUNGNAHME ZU DEN VORSCHLÄGEN ÜBER DIE BEHANDLUNG VON ARTNAMEN, DIE GLEICHZEITIG ZUR BEICHNUNG SOWOHL EINER ART WIE AUCH ALS ERSATZ DES NAMES EINER ANDEREN ART VERÖFFENTLICHT WURDEN

Zu den in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 7, Pt. 4, p. 119–129 geäuberten Vorschlägen hat sich der Stab der Zoologen sowohl des Museums Berlin wie auch nach Mitteilung von Dr. Walter Forster von der Zoologischen Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates der der 12 befragten Mitgliedern des Museums München wie folgt entschieden :

In einem solchen Falle ist der betreffende Name als für die Bezeichnung eines Arten-Gemisches verwendet anzusehen ; die Entscheidung trifft der erste auswählende Autor. Sicherungsklauseln zur Erhaltung der Stabilität sind notwendig.

Mit 14 von 14 Mitgliedern des Museums Berlin wird der Zwang zur Auswahl eines Lektotypus einer solchen Art nach der Lokalität, die etwa ein solcher Name bezeichnet, *abgelehnt.*

DOCUMENT 6/12

By **CURTIS W. SABROSKY** (*United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Administration, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, D.C., U.S.A.*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 9th July, 1952

PROBLEM ON SUBSTITUTE NAMES [Z.N.(S.) 361]

It seems to me that in cases where an author has clearly proposed a substitute name for a homonym, there can be only one nomenclatural conclusion : the substitute name replaces the homonym and takes the same type as the latter (choice " c " in paragraph **13**, pp. 127–128). Misidentification, *i.e.*, misapplication of the substitute name, does not overrule the fact that the author recognized the existing homonymy and took a step to correct it.

I am not sure from the evidence presented that Dr. Arkell's cases (both paragraphs **8** and **15**) are relevant. In paragraph 8 there is no mention of a preoccupied name that is being replaced by *Quenstedtoceras douvillei*. Merely stating that a name is a " nom. mut." or " nom. nov." does not automatically make it a substitute name, as I understand the latter term. If one discovers a misidentification, concludes that the misidentified species is actually new and unnamed, and names it, he has not proposed a substitute name, from the standpoint of nomenclature. It is a new species. In other words, I disagree with adding the expression " or for some incorrect use of such a name " to the statement of part (a) on page 122.

Both here and in part (b), I believe that such names rest upon the descriptions or figures upon which they are based, either new or previously published.

DOCUMENT 6/13

Statement of the views of the

COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK

Enclosure to a letter, dated 10th July, 1952, from

DR. JOHN T. ZIMMER, Chairman.

(For an extract from the above letter, see Document 1/41)

N.Z.(S.) 361. A specific (" trivial ") name applied to particular specimens but stated to be a substitute name for some previously published name. We recommend approval of a statement that any such substitute name is automatically synonymous with the earlier name and has the same type, regardless of whether a new type is proposed for the new name, or whether a redescription is given.

A curious problem is presented of a new species based partly on previously published [but unnamed] descriptions and partly on new material but without designation of a holotype, although named after the original author or the locality from which his, but not the new, material was obtained. If a " lectotype " is to be selected, should it be necessarily from the original author's material or his original named locality ? We have no decided opinions. Presumably no such restrictions should be demanded, although if the name of the new form is based on a definite locality, it might be desirable to have the lectotype from the same locality.

A.M.N.H. Committee on Nomenclature

(signed) EDWIN R. COLLETT
JOHN T. NICHOLS
ERNST MAYR
GEORGE H. H. TATE
JOHN T. ZIMMER (*Chairman*)

DOCUMENT 6/14

By **HENNING LEMCHE** (*Universitetets Zoologiska Museum, Copenhagen*)

Extract from a letter dated 20th July, 1952

On your interesting and exhaustive comments [in vol. 7 of the *Bull zool. Nomencl.*] on double indications (Z.N.(S.) 361) . . . I have no comments.

DOCUMENT 6/15

By **E. RAYMOND HALL** (*University of Kansas, Department of Zoology, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 22nd July, 1952

Follow the name replaced.

DOCUMENT 6/16

Statement of the views of certain members of the

NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY

Letter, dated 26th July, 1952, with enclosures,
from Dr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman

SUBSTITUTE NAME APPLIED TO PARTICULAR SPECIMEN ; Z.N.(S.) 361

I enclose herewith copies of comments on this subject, received from members of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology.

Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty, who is also a member of this committee, submitted a paper entitled " The Application of a Trivial Name which, when First Published, Is Applied to a Particular Species or Specimen, but Which is Stated Also to Be a Substitute Name for Some Previously Published Name ", at the recent symposium conducted by the Pacific Section of the society. Unfortunately I have mislaid my copy of Dr. Dougherty's paper, but I am informed that he has furnished you with a copy, for publication in the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.**

***Note by the Secretary :** At the time of the receipt of Dr. Follett's letter of 26th July, I had not received any paper from Dr. Dougherty on this case, but later I received from him a letter dated 3rd October, 1952, with which he enclosed a paper dealing both with this subject and with the problem of a species to be recognised as the type-species of a nominal genus, the name of which was first published in a generic synonymy. This document is annexed to the present series as Document 6/19.

Annexe 1 to Dr. Follett's letter of 24th July, 1952

Extract from a letter dated 20th May, 1952 from **HENRY TOWNES** (*North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering of the University of North Carolina, Raleigh, North Carolina, U.S.A.*)

(5) I would suggest that the type would depend on how the new name was proposed : (1) as a simple substitution or (2) as a name for certain specimens, which application would make it a substitution.

Annexe 2 to Dr. Follett's letter of 24th July, 1952

Statement furnished by **JOHN T. SIMMER**

(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

361. Specific (" trivial ") name applied to particular specimens but definitely stated to be a substitute for an earlier name should be automatically synonymous with such earlier name ; regardless of a possible attempt to propose another specimen as type of the new name, the type remains that of the older name.

DOCUMENT 6/17

By **J. CHESTER BRADLEY** (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

Statement received on 30th July, 1952

COMMISSIONS REFERENCE [Z.N (S.) 361]

The situation will be clarified if we accept the following postulate :

Case (a), where a trivial name stated to be a substitute for another name, but at the same time is based on particular specimens

A trivial name is not an objective substitute for another trivial name unless it is defined by the same holotype, lectotype, or neotype.

When an author proposes a new name as a substitute for a previously existing name without any qualification, that name automatically acquires the same holotype, lectotype or neotype as the earlier name. (If the earlier name has only syntypes, these are syntypes of the substitute name but neither is objectively defined until a lectotype or neotype is chosen.)

When an author in proposing a new name states that it is a substitute for a pre-existing name, but at the same time qualifies it in such a way as to preclude its holotype or syntypes from being the holotype or syntypes of the pre-existing name, he has as much contradicted himself as though in describing a species he had said that its head bore dense setae and elsewhere had said that the head of the holotype was devoid of setae.

In such a case, one of three courses is logically open :—

(*a*) To consider that the statement that the name is proposed as a substitute for a specified pre-existing name takes precedence over any and every qualifying statement, and that the holotype (or lectotype or neotype if or when established) of the pre-existing name is also that of the substituted name. (This is the result attained from solution C of the Secretary's paragraph 13.)

(*b*) To consider that the author of the later name in reality established a new species, based on such holotype or syntypes, or other material as he may have indicated, and that his statement that it was a substitute name for the specified pre-existing name was a wholly subjective opinion. In such a case what the author meant to do was to create a new nominal species which he subjectively considered to be a junior synonym of the pre-existing nominal species, but believed to be a name which would replace the older name on the grounds that the latter was pre-occupied by a still older homonym. Whether he was correct or not is immaterial but the name would not have the nomenclatorial status of a substitute name.

(*c*) To consider that the author has so completely contradicted himself as to nullify all grounds for accepting the name as validated under Article 25, and therefore to assign it to the status of a *nomen nudum.*

While any of these three courses could apply, the rules should specify which one *is* to apply.

To me the last course, Course (*c*), would appear the most objectionable. The second course, Course (*b*), would in effect strike out the word " new name " and substitute " new species (or sub-species)". It would seem to me the most desirable course, because it would almost always most closely interpret the intent of the original author. It is quite clear that the author in any such case was really describing and naming the material before him, and that it was his subjective misinterpretation of an older name that led him into the error of supposing that his new name would supplant the older one, and therefore to the quite untenable conclusion that his name was a substitute name for the other. The first course, Course (*a*) (one of the three suggested as possible by the Secretary) would be arbitrary but not really objectionable if it were found that it had actually been the one most often applied in such cases. Even if it would not interpret the author's intent so closely as Course (*b*), that is of less importance than to prevent disturbance.

The Secretary has pointed out weaknesses inherent in the solutions that he numbered (1) and (2), and it appears to me that they must be rejected.

In an accompanying paper* on Article 31, I have shown that there is no such thing as an objectively composite species, it is at most merely subjectively so until it is objectively defined, and such objective definition when once attained must be projected back to its origin. Once it has been objectively defined, which occurred at the outset if it had a holotype, any other specimens, paratypes or not that were subjectively erroneously (in later opinion) associated with it were merely misidentified specimens. To introduce this confusion of a composite species into the present case would make a bad matter worse, and be actually vicious.

---

* See Case No. 46, Document 46/1.

The Secretary also raises serious objections to his Course (2), put forward by Dr. Hinton. This solution appears to me far-fetched and so tenuous in its logic that it would probably be misapplied by a large proportion of authors who might try to follow it. There is no need for it and I should emphatically reject it.

Case (b), where a trivial name when published is applied to given specimens and implicitly treated as a substitute name.

It seems to me that propositions (1) and (2) in paragraph 17 should be opposed ; but I should not object to a *Recommendation* to the effect suggested, provided some such qualification be added as " in the absence of strong contraindication ".

It is quite possible that the second author in such a case based his description on material before him, and that the material or figures of the older species were only brought in by subjective misidentification. In such case selection of a lectotype from the types or figures of the older nominal species would be strongly contraindicated, and a mandatory provision requiring it would be very objectionable.

In connection with this whole matter of substitute names, certain procedures should be suggested to authors :

(1) that where they wish merely to replace a preoccupied name, that it be done without any qualification as to the characters of the nominal species involved ;

(2) that where it becomes necessary to discuss the characters of the taxonomic species in the same paper in which the substitute name is proposed, the author should make it clear that he is either (a) discussing the type material of the earlier nominal species or (b) discussing his subjective interpretation of that species, and that he is definitely *not* setting up any different types for the substitute name and no description that could in any way take precedence as concerns that name over the type and description of the name being replaced. Probably this could still better be covered by a mandatory provision to the effect that, after 1953, any name proposed with the statement that it is a substitute name for or a new name to replace a previously existing name, has automatically the same type material as the name that it supplants, notwithstanding any contrary statement made by its proposer, or any incompatible description that he may publish.

It should also be called to attention in a *Recommendation*, that if the author's desire is primarily to publish on certain material that he has studied, which he subjectively identifies with a previously described species bearing a preoccupied name, that the correct course is to describe his material as a new species ; then to cite the preoccupied name as a senior (but unavailable because pre-occupied) subjective synonym.

While the whole discussion has been in terms of trivial names, exactly the same principles apply to generic names which should be covered at the same time.

Genus *A-us* Brown 1800 has its type-species "*z*", (or subsequently has its type species selected to be "z"), but is a homonym of *A-us* Black 1775. In 1850 *A-us* Brown is replaced by the new name *B-us* White, with no statement of type species. Under Article 21f the type-species of each nominal genus is *A-us z*.

If *B-us* White 1850 is established both as a substitute for *A-us* Brown 1800 (nec Black 1775) and assigned the type-species "*z*", no type-species having been established for *A-us* Brown, then that fact establishes "*z*" as type-species also of *A-us*, under the same rule.

But if z had been the established type-species of *A-us*, and *B-us* was established as a substitute name with the statement that its type-species is "*x*"; or if *A-us* had not had any type-species established and *B-us* was established as a substitute name with the designated type-species "*x*", and "*x*" for any reason was a species not available to become type of *A-us*, then the present *Règles* are silent as to what is to be done. In such case precisely the same contradiction has come about as in the case of trivial names that have been under discussion.

I suggest that provisions be made to cover such cases in the same way as proposed above for species, namely :

(1) So far as past cases are concerned to rule that the statement of type-species defined objectively the generic name, and that if a type-species was designated, the additional statement that the new name was a substitute for a pre-existing name represented nothing more than the subjective belief of the author that the two are taxonomic synonyms, and

(2) So far as future cases are concerned, to rule that the statement that a generic name is proposed as a new name or substitute name to replace a pre-existing name, is to definitely assign to it the same type-species as that of the older nominal genus, notwithstanding any contrary statement made by its author, or any incompatible description that he may publish.

DOCUMENT 6/18

By **K. H. L. KEY** (*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Division of Entomology, Canberra, Australia*)

Extract from a letter dated 4th September, 1952

(Note :—The main portion of the above letter was concerned with the problem of the emendation of names, on which a separate paper has been submitted by Dr. Key and which constitutes Document 5/26 of the Copenhagen Series.)

I have studied your proposals in connection with the other six questions referred to you by the Thirteenth Congress, and in general I find myself in hearty agreement with them.

DOCUMENT 6/19

By **ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY** (*Department of Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*)*

Enclosure to a letter dated 3rd October, 1952

PROBLEMS OF NOMENCLATORIAL PRACTICE NOW UNDER CONSIDERATION BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION : SECRETARY FRANCIS HEMMING'S FOURTH AND FIFTH PROBLEMS†

The problems here under consideration are respectively :

(i) The species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which was first published in a generic synonymy ; and

(ii) The application of a trivial name which, when first published, is applied to a particular species or specimen, but which is stated (or implied) also to be a substitute name for some previously published name.

The foregoing two problems are relatively minor ones, but provide a useful opportunity for examining certain Articles in the *Règles* more critically. It is my feeling that both can be solved quite simply by extending to them the application of these Articles. In neither case has Secretary Hemming in his respective papers on these problems (in part 4 of volume 7 of the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1952) raised the specific points that I am presenting here.

2. In my own systematic work I have never found it necessary to decide a case in either category. What I have to say, therefore, is in the nature of a theoretical evaluation of the problem.

3. It seems logical that, wherever possible, problems not explicitly or clearly soluble under the existing *Règles* (even as extensively emended at Paris) should be examined with the aim of finding, in the already established body of nomenclatorial law, principles that can be extended to cover the problems in question. It seems likely to me that such will in most cases accord best with general practice, for it is reasonable to suppose that the majority of workers have been guided in this way. At the same time it must be recognized that wherever ambiguities or inadequacies exist in the *Règles* (and there have been

---

* Research Fellow of the American Cancer Society (as recommended by the Committee of Growth of the National Research Council, 1949–1952.)

† *Ed. Note.* These problems have since been renumbered and are now Cases 6 and 7 respectively.

many, of which only a part have as yet been resolved), differencies in interpretation and procedure undoubtedly have arisen. Therefore, it will probably be necessary, after any new concept is formally established, that the International Commission review a certain number of cases where the new ruling would create unjustified confusion.

A. The species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which was first published in a generic synonymy.

4. As Secretary Hemming has pointed out in his paper, this question can arise only in connection with generic names published before 1st January, 1931. He has actually put two questions to zoologists : first, whether a nominal genus should have any availability at all from the date on which it was first published in the synonymy of a previously published name ; and, second, whether, in the event that the answer to this first question is yes, one should " (a) treat, as type-species of the genus concerned, the species (whatever it may be) which is the type-species of the nominal genus, with the name of which the generic name under consideration was synonymized at the time when it was first published, or (b) . . . regard, as eligible for selection as the type-species of such a genus all the species cited on the occasion when the generic name was first published in the synonymy of another generic name ".

5. In connection with the first of the foregoing two questions I take the view that a generic name published in a generic synonymy is automatically provided with an " indication " in the sense of Article 25 and should therefore be available for nomenclatorial purposes.

6. As regards the second question I propose a solution which I have suggested in a paper now in press in the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.**. This involves the treatment of generic names first published in a generic synonymy as falling under the scope of Article 35, rule (f). The latter rule states (in the currently used English text) : " In case a generic name without originally designated type is proposed as a substitute for another generic name, with or without type, the type of either, when established, becomes *ipso facto* type of the other."

7. Secretary Hemming has discussed this rule in a recent paper in part 2 of volume 6 of the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* (1952, pp. 45–48). He has pointed out that it is ambiguous in certain respects and has proposed that it be redrafted to read : " In case a generic name without originally designated type is expressly published as a substitute, for some specified generic name of older date with or without type, the type of either, when established, becomes *ipso facto* type of the other."

8. I have perceived still another defect in rule (f), which I have set out in the paper mentioned. From paragraph 8 of this paper it may be seen that the publication of a generic name for the first time in a generic synonymy might be conveniently regarded as tantamount to the express publication of that name as a substitute for the earlier generic name, in the sense of Mr. Hemming's redrafted Article 30, rule (f); it would then follow that any limitation to be placed on the species eligible for selection as type of a substitute genus should apply to the special case of generic names originally published in generic synonymies. Thus, in effect, I agree with the first of Mr. Hemming's alternative proposals, namely that one should " treat, as type-species of the genus concerned, the species (whatever it may be) which is [or is selected to be] the type species of the nominal genus, with the name of which the generic name under consideration was synonymized when it was first published."

---

* See Case No. 43, Document 43/1.

9. Since writing my paper on Article 30, rule (f), I have come to recognize a further difficulty with this rule upon which neither Secretary Hemming nor I have commented. It occurs to me that under certain circumstances it may be difficult to apply this rule even though ostensibly it would be invocable within the restrictions imposed by both Mr. Hemming's and my proposed emendations. There are certainly situations where a given author may specifically propose a a generic name as a substitute for some specified generic name of older date (and this would, on my interpretation, include generic names first cited in synonymy of an earlier genus), yet where the later generic name would clearly apply to quite a different generic concept because, in an extreme case, of previous elimination of all the species included in the original nominal genus. Thus, there might arise a situation where the later generic name would be quite inappropriate as a substitute for the earlier nominal genus—by reason, for example, of its etymology, which might connote attributes not possessed by the species or group of species, to which, perforce, it would have to apply.

10. In answer to this objection may be cited Article 32, which reads " A generic or a specific name, once published, cannot be rejected, even by its author, because of inappropriateness." With this concept already firmly established in the *Règles*, the foregoing argument loses much of its force.

11. In conclusion, therefore, it is my feeling that a simple and desirable solution to the problem of determining type-species for nominal genera first published in generic synonymies would be to construe them as falling under the provisions of Article 30, rule (f), as clarified and restricted by Secretary Hemming and by me.

B. The application of a trivial name which, when first published, is applied to a particular species or specimen, but which is stated (or implied) also to be a substitute for some previously published name.

12. It is obvious that a problem arises in this connection only when there are more than one species involved—that is, where the specimens on which the description in question is based belong in whole or in part to a different species from that for which the name is proposed as (or implied) to be a substitute. This point is implicit in Mr. Hemming's discussion, but is not clearly stated by him.

13. He proposes three possible solutions : " (a) a ruling that a nominal species [so] established is to be treated as a composite species and therefore that the species to which the new trivial name is to adhere should be a matter for determination under Article 31 [the first reviser principle] ; (b) a ruling that in such a case two nominal species, bearing identical specific names (*i.e.*, identical combinations of generic name and specific trivial name) are to be deemed to have been established, one of these names to be held to apply to the species bearing the rejected specific name, the other to the species described under the new name, the relative priority to be accorded to these two homonyms to be determined in accordance with the procedure laid down for determining the relative priority to be accorded to any pair of names published in the same book and on the same date ; (c) a ruling that the new specific name in question is to be treated as applying automatically to the species bearing the rejected name (*i.e.*, that such a name should be treated strictly as a substitute name), the other use of the new name being treated as having been due to a misidentification on the part of the author concerned."

14. Mr. Hemming favors the third of these solutions. His reasons are good ones, and I find myself in essential agreement. I will not review them here.

15. I should like, however, to fortify Mr. Hemming's stand by pointing out that this third solution is most in harmony with a part of Article 31 (the second sentence, which, according to a Paris decision, is to be incorporated into an otherwise much emended Article). This sentence reads " . . . a specific [trivial] name which undoubtedly rests upon an error of identification cannot be retained for . . . [a] . . . misdetermined species even if the species in question are afterwards placed in different genera."

16. There is a close parallel here between the problem under discussion and the situation described in the quoted sentence. In both cases a misidentification of two (or more) species is involved, but in one case an author finds it necessary to propose a new name. By analogy with the sentence in Article 31 the new name would follow the earlier species—that is, could not " be retained for . . . misdetermined species."

17. Mr. Hemming has also raised the question as to how to handle the subsidiary situation whereunder a new trivial name is implicitly applied on the basis of objective criteria as a substitute for an earlier name (as by the use of an earlier author's name or the locality of his type material in forming the new name) and at the same time applied to new material belonging to a different species. He seeks the advice of specialists as to whether the name should apply only to the earlier material. In my opinion such names should be so restricted.

18. In conclusion, I repeat my advocacy of Mr. Hemming's third solution to the general problem under consideration : namely, that a new specific name which, when first published, is applied to a particular species or specimen, but which is stated (or clearly implied) to be a substitute for some previously published name, is to be treated as applying automatically to the species bearing the rejected name.

PUR

CONTENTS

(continued from front wrapper)

STATUS OF A SPECIFIC TRIVIAL NAME PUBLISHED AS A SUBSTITUTE NAME BUT AT THE SAME TIME APPLIED TO A PARTICULAR SPECIES OR TO PARTICULAR SPECIMENS, IN CASES WHERE THE SPECIES CONCERNED DIFFERS FROM THAT TO WHICH THE EARLIER NAME IS APPLICABLE : DOCUMENTS

		Page
D.6/1	Origin of present investigation	167
D.6/2	General consultation with specialists and issue of an appeal for advice in 1952	168
D.6/3	Proposal submitted by W. J. ARKELL (*Cambridge*) ...	169
D.6/4	Proposal submitted by H. E. HINTON (*Bristol*)	172

Statements furnished in response to the Appeal in the Secretary's 1952 Survey

D.6/5	R. CASEY (*London*)	174
D.6/6	G. H. E. HOPKINS (*Tring, England*)	177
D.6/7	LESLIE BAIRSTOW (*London*)	179
D.6/8	G. KRUSEMAN (*Amsterdam*)	180
D.6/9	THEODOR HALTENORTH (*München*)	181
D.6/10	C. W. WRIGHT (*London*)	183
D.6/11	ERICH M. HERING (*Berlin*)	185
D.6/12	CURTIS W. SABROSKY (*Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)...	186
D.6/13	AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK	187
D.6/14	HENNING LEMCHE (*Copenhagen*)	188
D.6/15	E. RAYMOND HALL (*Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) ...	188
D.6/16	SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY (*U.S.A.*) ...	189
D.6/17	J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) ...	190
D.6/18	K. H. L. KEY (*Canberra, Australia*)	194
D.6/19	ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY (*Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*)	195

Triple-Part 3/5 (Emendation of names)

It had been intended to publish the present Part simultaneously with Triple-Part 3/5 (containing the series of documents received in regard to the problem of the emendation of names). That Part (pp. 61–166) is now in the press but technical production difficulties render it unlikely that it will be possible to publish it until a few days after the publication of the present Part.

Printed in England by METCALFE & COOPER LIMITED, 10-24 Scrutton St., London E C 2

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

VOLUME 10. Part 7
pp. 199—230

14*th July*, 1953

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS:

Documents relating to Cases 7 to 16 prepared for consideration
at Copenhagen, July-August 1953

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1953

Price Twelve Shillings and Sixpence

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (6th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Part 7 (pp. 199–230) 14th July 1953

EDITORIAL NOTE

The present Part contains the documents prepared for consideration at Copenhagen in relation to ten cases. These are those to which the Case Numbers 7 to 16 have been allotted.

2. The first of these papers (numbered Case No. 7) is a Report by the Secretary on the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus the name of which was published, prior to 1st January, 1931, in a generic synonymy without any other indication. This is a subject on which at Paris in 1948 the Secretary was asked to undertake an investigation, in conjunction with interested specialists, and to submit a Report for consideration at Copenhagen in 1953. As explained in the Report now submitted, the subject with which it is concerned is embraced in a wider problem relating to the status generally of *nomina nuda* published in synonymies—whether generic names or trivial names—which was raised by Dr. Ernst Mayr and which forms the subject of Case No. 33 in the present volume. For the reasons explained in the foregoing Report, the whole of the documentation received—both that received in regard to the issue discussed in Paris and also that concerned with the wider issue raised by Dr. Mayr—has been grouped together under Case No. 33.

3. The next eight cases included in the present Part (Cases Nos. 8–15) are all concerned with problems relating to the formation of names and to the conditions in which various classes of very similar names are to be regarded as homonyms of one another. The problems involved are the following :—

Case No. 8.	Article 14 : formation of a generic name or a trivial name based upon the name of a modern personage, the first portion of which consists of the particle " M " (Z.N.(S.)484).
Case No. 9.	Articles 8 and 14 : choice of connective vowels in the formation of names consisting of compound words (Z.N.(S.)736).
Case No. 10.	Article 14, Paragraph (3) Section (c) : method to be followed when forming a trivial name based upon the surname of a Russian woman on the transliteration of that name from the Cyrillic alphabet to the Latin alphabet (Z.N.(S.)266).

Case No. 11. Article 14 : problem arising in connection with trivial names based upon modern patronymics in cases where those patronymics are in a Latinised form (Z.N.(S.)737).

Case No. 12. Article 14 : question of the formation of a trivial name based upon a modern patronymic in cases where that patronymic consists of more than two words, of which the first is the definite article (Z.N.(S.)503).

Case No. 13. Article 14 : procedure to be followed when forming a trivial name based either (1) upon the name of a modern personage where that name is preceded by a nobiliar particle or (2) upon the name of a Christian Saint (Z.N.(S.)740).

Case No. 14. Article 14 : proposed regularisation of the status of trivial names based on modern patronymics, when formed as adjectives (Z.N.(S.)661).

Case No. 15. Article 14 : question whether it is desirable that trivial names based upon modern patronymics in the genitive singular and incorrectly formed with a terminal double "*ii*" should, as decided in Paris in 1948, be subject to automatic correction (Z.N.(S.)705).

4. The last case (Case No. 16) included in the present Part is concerned with a question which arises directly in connection with Article 14, though a provision dealing with it would probably come more appropriately at some other point in the *Règles*. It is concerned with the gender to be attributed to generic names consisting of compound words of Greek or Latin origin (Z.N.(S.)440).

CASE NO. 7

ON THE QUESTION OF THE SPECIES TO BE ACCEPTED AS THE TYPE SPECIES OF A NOMINAL GENUS, THE NAME OF WHICH WAS FIRST PUBLISHED IN A GENERIC SYNONYMY

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)387)

REPORT BY FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

At Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature agreed to recommend " that the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to make a thorough study, in conjunction with interested specialists, of the problems relating to the determination of the type species of a genus, the name of which was first published in the synonymy of some other genus, and to submit a comprehensive Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration by the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission to the Congress, of recommendations for the insertion in the *Règles* of appropriate provisions dealing with the above matter " (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 351—352). This recommendation, with other recommendations, was submitted to, and approved by, the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its Fourth Meeting held on 26th July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 103).

2. As in the case of the other general problems relating to the *Règles* which had been referred to me for study by the Paris Congress of 1948, I took every opportunity which offered during the ensuing period to ascertain the views held by interested specialists, in order that the Report to be submitted to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology when it met at Copenhagen in 1953 should be as complete as it was possible to make it. In September 1950, however, I received from Dr. Ernst Mayr an important letter (dated 30th August), with which was enclosed a memorandum dealing generally with the problem of *nomina nuda* listed in synonymy. The problem raised by Dr. Mayr was considerably broader than that which had been referred to me in Paris, for it covered the position of trivial names published without description

in specific synonymies as well as that of generic names similarly published in generic synonymies. Moreover, the question of the availability of names published in this way was called in question by Dr. Mayr, whereas in Paris the view had been taken that generic names published in generic synonymies possessed a status of availability and that the problem to be considered was the procedure to be followed in determining the species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which had been published in this way. There was however a clear overlap between Dr. Mayr's proposals on the one hand and, on the other hand, the more limited problem which had been referred to me for investigation.

3. On receipt of Dr. Mayr's proposal, I came to the conclusion that the correct course at that stage was to treat these two problems as distinct subjects and to pursue the task which had been entrusted to me by the Paris Congress. Accordingly, towards the close of 1951, I prepared a survey of the problems involved in the subject which had been referred to me by the Paris Congress, but in doing so, I drew attention to the proposal which had been submitted by Dr. Mayr, in order thereby to elicit comments on that proposal as well as on the narrower question with which I was then immediately concerned. The survey so prepared was published (together with similar surveys on the other problems which had been referred to me by the Paris Congress) in March (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 109–118). In addition, I took the steps described in the Introductory Note to volume 8 of the present serial publication (1953, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **8** : 2–3) to bring to the attention of zoologists and palaeontologists the present, and the other six, problems on which in Paris in 1948 I had been asked, as Secretary to the International Commission, to confer with interested specialists and, having done so, to prepare Reports for consideration at Copenhagen in 1953. Both in the surveys published in volume 7 of the *Bulletin* and in the communications later issued through the scientific press and also individually to Nomenclature Committees, I appealed to all interested workers to furnish statements setting out their views as to the action which it was desirable should be taken by the Copenhagen Congress.

4. In the course of 1952 I received a large number of statements in regard to the present subject. The majority of these dealt in varying degrees of fullness with the wider issues raised by Dr. Mayr. In a few cases only did the statements received deal with the limited question of the species to be accepted as the type species of a genus, the name of which was first published in a generic synonymy. Of those workers who did touch on this subject, almost all were of the opinion that, if generic names published in this way were to be accepted, the genus, the name of which was published in synonymy must be regarded as identical with the genus, in the synonymy of the name of which it was published. In other words, the view was taken that a genus, the name of which was published in this way must have as its type species the same species as the genus, with the name of which the name of the new genus was synonymised at the time of its first publication. One correspondent, however, took the view that in a case of this kind the species to be accepted as the type species should be whatever species was selected as such by the first reviser. Another suggested that such names might be dealt with as substitute names under Rule (f) in Article 30. A number of correspondents drew attention to the fact that there was an essential difference between (1) a generic name published without an indication in a generic synonymy and (2) a generic name which, though treated, at the time of its first publication, as a synonym of some other generic name was nevertheless on that occasion accompanied by a generic diagnosis or other " indication " prepared by the author by whom the name had first been used in manuscript.

5. After reviewing the entire documentation received, I have come to the conclusion that the two problems—that is, the narrow Paris problem and the wider Mayr problem—are so closely related to one another that the most convenient course will be to treat these two questions as forming part of a single subject. For, if at Copenhagen the general feeling is in favour of Dr. Mayr's thesis, the question raised at Paris will cease to be a practical issue, since generic names published in generic synonymies will be declared to possess no status of availability. No useful discussion of the species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which was published in a generic synonymy could therefore usefully be undertaken until a conclusion has been reached on the broader issue raised by Dr. Mayr. It is evident, however, from the particulars given in paragraph 4 above that, if generic names of the class with which the present Report is concerned, were to be accepted as available names, there is substantial agreement as to how the type species of such a genus should be determined.

6. In these circumstances, I have grouped the whole of the material in a single series as forming the documentation submitted in relation to a single case. The Case so established has been allotted the Case No. 33. This case, being concerned mainly with the availability of a certain class of name has been placed with the other proposals which have been received in relation to Article 25. In view of the mandate given to me by the Paris Congress to investigate the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which was first published in a generic synonymy, I have felt it necessary however to make the present brief Report on the action which I have taken to discharge the duty entrusted to me in 1948.

PART 2

PROBLEMS RELATING TO THE TEXT OF THE " RÈGLES ", OTHER THAN THE SEVEN PROBLEMS ON WHICH THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY CALLED FOR SPECIAL REPORTS FOR SUBMISSION TO THE FOURTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY AT COPENHAGEN IN 1953

CASE NO. 8

ARTICLE 14 : FORMATION OF A GENERIC NAME OR A TRIVIAL NAME BASED UPON THE NAME OF A MODERN PERSONAGE, THE FIRST PORTION OF WHICH CONSISTS OF THE PARTICLE " M "

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)484)

DOCUMENT 8/1

By **G. H. E. HOPKINS,** O.B.E., M.A. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *The Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)

Letter dated 27th September, 1950

The Commission has dealt (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 206, 207, 208) with the question of Mac, Mc and O', but M' (which logically should be dealt with in the same way as O') is not mentioned. It is a rare form, but one occasionally comes across it. In the London Telephone Directory for Oct. 1949, volume L-R, you will find M'Cardell (p. 3194) and M'Lachlan (p. 3221).

DOCUMENT 8/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(1) Letter, dated 3rd October, 1950, to Mr. G. H. E. Hopkins

Mac, Mc, and M' names (*Z.N.*(*S.*) 484)

I entirely agree with you that " M' " names ought to have been dealt with at the same time as " Mac " and " Mc " names. I agree further that the logical course would be to treat these names in the same way as " O' " names. It will however be necessary also for all three of the names shown in the above heading to ensure that for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy these variations are to be ignored. You will have noted that this was done as regards " Mac " and " Mc " names (see Point (4) on page 208 of vol. 4 of *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*).

I think that the best thing will be for me to take up this point with the zoologist who put forward the original proposal and to suggest to him that he should put in a supplementary proposal to deal with the point which you have raised, and which I am very grateful to you for having brought to attention.

(2) Letter dated 31st October, 1950, to Professor Pierre Bonnet (University of Toulouse)

You will recall that at the Paris Congress, it was agreed, in response to a proposition submitted by yourself, to add provisions to Article 14 prescribing the correct method of forming a trivial name based on a surname commencing with " Mac ", " Mc " or " O' " (paragraph (1) (e) of Conclusion 11 of 7th Meeting, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 206—207), and also to add to Article 35 (or rather to the Article which is to replace Article 35) a provision stating that two trivial names based on surnames that differ only in that in the one case it commences with " Mac ", and in the other with " Mc " are to be regarded as identical for purposes of the Law of Homonymy (para. (4) of the above-mentioned Conclusion, *loc. cit.*: 208).

I have now received a latter from Mr. G. H. E. Hopkins (of the British Museum (Natural History)) drawing attention to the somewhat rarer case, which nevertheless does turn up from time to time, of names commencing with " M' ", which should also be dealt with under the new provisions.

I would like to suggest that you might submit a proposal supplementary to those which you submitted, and which were agreed, at the Paris Congress, suggesting that trivial names based on surnames beginning with " M' " (*e.g.*, M'Cardell, M'Lachlan) should be formed analogously to those based on names beginning with " O' " (para. (1) (e) of Conclusion 11) and that trivial names based on names beginning " M' " should be regarded as identical, for purposes of the Law of Homonymy, with trivial names based on surnames differing from the latter only by the fact that they begin with " Mac " or " Mc " instead of " M' ". (Para. (4) of the same Conclusion.)

DOCUMENT 8/3

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse, France*)

Letter dated 8th November, 1950

Bien recu votre lettre du 31 octobre, à laquelle je réponds sans retard.

Il n'a a pas de doute que les noms spécifiques commençant par *M'* (*M'Cardell, M'Lachlan*) rentrent dans la même catégorie que ceux qui commencent par *Mac* on *Mc*. C'est d'ailleurs un oubli de ma part si je ne l'ai pas mis dans la remarque de ma proposition 5, car dans mon travail original ou j'ai traité la question ; j'avais ecrit : " *Pour les noms avec la particule Mac*, les abreviations Mc et *M' doivent toujours être retablies en entier : MacCook, McCook, M'Cook doivent tous les trois donner le même nom spécifique que l'on ecrira toujours maccooki* ".

Vous pouvez donc rédiger une proposition additive a la Conclusion 11, parag. 4, disant que " *les noms spécifiques formés des noms de personnes commencant par M'* (*comme M'Cook, M'Lachlan*) *sont, selon l'article* 35, *homonymes de ceux commencant par Mac on Mc* (*maccooki = mccooki = m'cooki*) *; de ce fait, pour l'avenir, il y a lieu d'uniformiser l'écriture de ces termes en écrivant les prefixes Mc on M' en entier : maccooki, maclachlani* ".

Je pense qu'ainsi cela est tres clair et pourra convenir.

DOCUMENT 8/4

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

SUPPLEMENTARY PROPOSAL TO APPLY TO GENERIC NAMES, FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE LAW OF HOMONYMY, THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY PROFESSOR PIERRE BONNET IN RESPECT OF TRIVIAL NAMES

As noted in Document 8/1 the Paris Congress dealt with the position, under the Law of Homonymy, of trivial names commencing with such particles as " Mac " and " Mc " and the proposals now submitted in Document 8/3 fills in an omission as regards trivial names commencing with the particle " M ". In Paris the decisions then taken in regard to trivial names commencing with the particles " Mac ", " Mc " and " O' " were applied also to generic names of this type (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 208), but by an inadvertence this was not done for names commencing with the particle " O' ". It is suggested that this should now for this class of name and also for names commencing with the particle " M " dealt with, so far as trivial names are concerned, in Professor Bonnet's present application. (Document 8/3.)

CASE NO. 9

ARTICLES 8 AND 14 : CHOICE OF CONNECTIVE VOWELS IN THE FORMATION OF NAMES CONSISTING OF COMPOUND WORDS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)736)

DOCUMENT 9/1

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse*)

(Communicated by Professor H. BOSCHMA (Leiden) under cover of a letter dated 8th August, 1951)

PROPOSITION D'UNE RÈGLEMENTATION POUR LA FORMATION DES TERMES SCIENTIFIQUES COMPOSÈS DE DEUX MOTS (CHOIX DE LA VOYELLE DE LIAISON)

L'étude de plusieurs centaines de mots scientifiques composés permet à l'auteur d'établir une réglementation concernant la formation correcte de ces termes ; toutes les modalités possibles ont été etudiées.

(1*e*) termes formés d'un adjectif précédé d'un préfixe invariable (*subaequalis, bimaculatus, polydactylus*) avec des remarques sur la suppression de l'hiatus (*monoculus, quadrangulatus*) ou son maintien (*bioculatus, triangulifer*).

(2*e*) termes formés soit de deux adjectifs, soit d'un substantif et d'un adjectif, soit d'un substantif et d'un verbe devenu adjectif verbal avec choix de la voyelle de liaison : *o* pour les racines grecques (*erythrocephalus, melanognatha, hydrophilus*), *i* pour les racines latines (*albimaculatus, nigriventris, lucifuga*). Remarques sur certaines exceptions (*galloprovincialis, fuscorufus, aurocinctus*) et sur la suppression de l'hiatus (*melanodontus, fulvaster*).

(3*e*) termes formés de deux substantifs (*tauricornu, densleonis, aviuminsulae*) dont le deuxième peut-être adjectivé (*anguicomus, a, um ; fronticornis, e ; formiciformis e*) (et non *formicaeformis*).

Ces règles sont accompagnées :

(1*e*) de remarques générals concernant les mots hybrides à éviter (*nigrocephalus, isopeda*) et l'utilisation du radical des mots pris au génitif (et non au nominatif, souvent irrégulier) pour la formation des termes composés (*nigritarsis* et non *nigeritarsis*, *Gastropoda* et non *Gasteropoda*, *Octopodidae* et non *Octopidae*).

(2*e*) une réglementation pratique concernant les termes mal formés déjà existants ; (a) ne pas les employer quand le terme correct coexiste et est aussi utilisé pour désigner un animal (*albimaculatus, albomaculatus : Gastropoda, Gasteropoda*) ; (b) les rectifier, s'ils n'ont été employés qui un petit nombre de fois ; (c) les maintenir, si un long usage, a, en quelque sorte, régularisé leur incorrection (comme automobile, en français ; comme *Lycosa albofasciata*, nommée ainsi deux à trois cents fois).

DOCUMENT 9/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

In connection with the foregoing paper by Professor Pierre Bonnet, it should be noted that in my survey of the problems involved in the emendation of names (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7 : 4–59) I drew attention (in paragraph 53) to the situation which arises when incorrect connective vowels are used in the formation of names consisting of compound words. Some comments on this subject will be found in the documents received in response to the appeal then made to specialists for advice on the question of the extent to which it is desirable that names should be emended or, on the other hand, should be allowed to stand in the incorrect form in which they were published. Reference should therefore be made to the documents published in the present volume under the Case No. 5.

2. Attention is drawn also to the proposals on this subject submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet with other proposals in his Proposition 8. This proposal was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 3 : 185–187) and is reprinted in the present volume as Document 17/1.

3. In this, as in other problems arising in connection with the emendation of names, there are potentially two questions involved. Of these the main question—from the logical point of view—is whether names consisting of erroneously spelt words of certain specified types are to be emended. If in any given case this main question is answered in the negative, an important second question arises, namely, whether two trivial names, of which one is correctly spelt and the other incorrectly spelt, are to be regarded as homonyms of one another. The following are examples drawn from Professor Bonnet's paper (Document 9/1) : *melanognatha* (correct) and *melanignatha* (incorrect) ; *formiciformis* (correct) and *formicaeformis* (incorrect). On this question attention is drawn to document 5/18 (:85), where Dr. J. Marvin Weller suggests that the provisions relating to the Law of Homonymy should be expanded so as to bring spelling variations of this kind within its scope. I entirely agree with Dr. Marvin Weller in this matter, for it would seem to me to be repugnant to common sense and quite intolerable to permit the co-existence within a single genus of two such specific trivial names as *formiciformis* and *formicaeformis*.

CASE NO. 10

ARTICLE 14, PARAGRAPH (3), SECTION (C) : METHOD TO BE FOLLOWED WHEN FORMING A TRIVIAL NAME BASED UPON THE SURNAME OF A RUSSIAN WOMAN ON THE TRANSLITERATION OF THAT NAME FROM THE CYRILLIC ALPHABET TO THE LATIN ALPHABET

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)266)

DOCUMENT 10/1

By **ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY**

(*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*)

Extract from a letter dated 18th September, 1946

Editorial Note : I discussed this question with Dr. Dougherty when he came to see me in August 1948, and he then added the following note to the File : " This point should be considered in relation to the suggestion by Bonnet in regard to the same question. I agree with Bonnet ". The paper by Professor Bonnet here referred to is his Proposition 5, consideration of which was deferred by the International Commission at its Session held in Paris in 1948. For an extract of the relevant portion of Professor Bonnet's proposal, see Document 10/2 (initialled) F.H. 28th May, 1953.

. . . .

In dealing with Article 14, point (c), I have been perplexed as to the manner of interpretation of part of the sentence dealing with modern patronymics. Paragraph 3, part c, begins as follows : " If the name is a modern patronymic, the genitive is always formed by adding to the exact and complete name, an *i* if the person is a man, or an *ae* if the person is a woman, even if the name has a Latin form . . . " Now procedure as regards the male patronymic is clear to me, but certain female patronymics offer difficulty. Let us suppose that a woman's surname ends in an *a*—e.g., Andreeva or Andreewa (from the Russian Андреева; according to a strict reading of the quoted sentence the trivial name formed from this patronymic should be *andreevaae* or *andreewaae*. But is such really meant by Article 14 ? Would not *andreevae* or *andreewae* be more logical—in other words adding of an *e* rather than *ae* to feminine patronymics already ending in *a* ? This Russian name brings up a further problem. A number of recent Soviet systematists—apparently perplexed by the problem already outlined—have solved it neatly, but, I presume, illegally, simply by using the *Russian* genitive in transliteration. The Russian genitive of Андреева Андреевой—Andreevoi or Andreewoi in transliteration. There is for example a nematode species *Kutassicaulus* (or *Otostrongylus*) *andreewoi*. Must the trivial name in this case be emended, and, if so, should it become *andreewaae*, or *andreewae* ?

DOCUMENT 10/2

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse*)

EXTRACT FROM PROPOSITION 5 SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE AT PARIS IN 1948

(Note : The above application was published in full in 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 3 : 181—162.)

(2) Si ce sont des personnes portant un nom moderne ou un prénom comme patronymique, le génitif est toujours formé par l'addition, (au nom exact et complet de la personne, écrit normalement dans sa langue, avec ses accents) d'un *i* quand cette personne est un homme, de *ae* quand c'est une dame, *orum* quand il s'agit d'un ménage ou de deux freres, *arum* s'il s'agit de deux soeurs :

……

…… *racovitzae*[‡], ……

[‡] Quand le nom d'une dame se termine par " e ", on change le " **a** " en " ae " ; *racovitzae* non *racovitzaae.*

CASE NO. 11

ARTICLE 14: PROBLEM ARISING IN CONNECTION WITH TRIVIAL NAMES BASED UPON MODERN PATRONYMICS IN CASES WHERE THOSE PATRONYMICS ARE IN A LATINISED FORM

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)737)

DOCUMENT 11/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

At Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature considered a proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet in regard to the formation of certain trivial names based upon the patronymics of modern personages when those patronymics are themselves in Latinised form. Professor Bonnet's proposal (his " Proposition 5 ") was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 181–182).

2. The proposal then adopted by the International Commission and approved by the International Congress was (a) that the normal rule should apply in such cases (i.e., that such trivial names, when formed in the genitive case, should consist of the complete (Latinised) patronymic of the person concerned, to which should be added the appropriate genitival ending), but (b) that exceptions should be permitted in certain specified cases, the procedure in such cases to be that the Latinised modern patronymic should be treated as though it were a Latin word and should be declined accordingly.

3. The exceptions thus agreed upon were the following three, namely trivial names based upon the names of (a) Linnaeus, (b) Fabricius, and (c) Poda. Accordingly, the correct form for trivial names based upon the patronymics of the foregoing zoologists are: *linnaei* (not *linnaeusi*) ; *fabricii* (not *fabriciusi*) ; *podae* (not *podai*) (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 206).

4. In the discussion leading up to the foregoing decision the view was expressed that " It was likely that experience would show the need for adding to the list of exceptions in this matter " (see 1950, *ibid.* **4** : 204, Point (iv)). This question is accordingly re-submitted for consideration in order to provide an opportunity of adding, should this be desired, to the list of exceptions agreed upon in 1948.

5. In the period which has elapsed since the Paris Session, only one case has been submitted as possibly qualifying as an exception. This case, which was brought forward by Mr. D. K. McE. Kevan (*University of Nottingham*), relates to the formation to be adopted in forming trivial names based upon the name of the Swedish entomologist C. V. S. Aurivillius. At present under Article 14, a trivial name based upon the name of this worker can be correctly formed only as " aurivilliusi " ; it appears however that in the majority of cases the form " *aurivillii* " has been adopted and is in use.

CASE NO. 12

ARTICLE 14 : QUESTION OF THE FORMATION OF A TRIVIAL NAME BASED UPON A MODERN PATRONYMIC IN CASES WHERE THAT PATRONYMIC CONSISTS OF MORE THAN TWO WORDS, OF WHICH THE FIRST IS THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)503)

Editorial Note : The above problem was initially raised (in a letter dated 28th November, 1950) by Dr. Reeve M. Bailey (*University of Michigan Ann Arbor.*). Eventually it was decided to ask the Nomenclature Committee of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, of which Dr. Bailey is a member, to consider this question and to submit its views to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. The concluding portion of the correspondence relating to this problem was therefore conducted with Mr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman of the above Committee. (Initialled) F.H. 31st May, 1953.

DOCUMENT 12/1

Explanatory Note by **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

Extract from a letter dated 5th July, 1951, to Mr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman, Nomenclature Committee, American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists

Preliminary consideration was given to this general question by the Commission at its meeting in 1948 when it was agreed that in view of the complexity of the issue and the desirability of ascertaining what was the practice (or majority practice) in various groups, the question should be deferred for further consideration (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 207–212). The principal points which call for decision appear to be :—

(1) What shall be the general rule for the formation of trivial names (and generic names) of the type in question [i.e., for trivial names based upon modern names such as " Lacépède "] ?

(2) Is such a trivial or generic name, when incorrectly formed, to be subject to automatic correction ?

(3) If not, what is to be the position as regards the Law of Homonymy ? That is, in that event, should the Code permit the use within the same genus both of the trivial name *lacepedei* and of the name *cepedei* ?

(4) If the answer to (2) above is " yes ", should provision be made for the granting of exceptions for the purpose of avoiding the alteration of an incorrectly formed name published prior to the introduction of rule may be decided upon in cases where an incorrectly formed name has acquired general currency ?

DOCUMENT 12/2

Statement furnished by the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ICHTHYOLOGISTS AND HERPETOLOGISTS

Letter dated 17th April, 1952, from Mr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman

Trivial names of the lacepedei/cepedei type

The American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, Committee on Zoological Nomenclature, has voted unanimously in favour of the following principles :

(1) That no general rule for the formation of trivial names (or generic names) of the type in question is desired.

(2) That such a trivial or generic name. when incorrectly formed, is not to be subject to automatic correction.

(3) That the Code should permit the use within the same genus both of the trivial name *lacepedei* and of the name *cepedei.*

(4) That the answer to (2) above being in the negative, no answer to your fourth question is indicated.

Excerpts from the correspondence of all committee members are the following :

Dr. Charles M. Bogert (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York City*) : " I seriously doubt whether any general rule could be set up for the formation of trivial or generic names of the type in question ".

Mr. W. I. Follett (*California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco*) : " My own thought on this matter is that the original orthography affords the only criterion that is wholly objective ".

Dr. Arnold B. Grobman (*University of Florida, Gainesville*) : " I do not think it wise to treat patronymics any differently than names of descriptive, geographical, or nonsense-syllable origin. All trivial names, including patronymics, should stand as originally proposed (except in obvious cases of a printer's error, etc.) ".

Dr. Robert Rush Miller (*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.*) : " For this specific example given above, I looked into the matter of whether one could really reach a clear-cut, objective decision on how to properly spell this patronymic. My conclusion is that this cannot be done, not only because the gentleman in question spelled his name La Cépède or Lacépède at various times (and hence the patronymic could properly have been formed *cepedei* or *lacepedei*) but, worse yet, this was not really the man's name at all but merely a title bestowed upon him (Comte de Lacépède). If in such an isolated case as this no reasonable solution presents itself, I should think that other examples would bring up similar difficulties and that no general rule could possibly cover all cases. I therefore conclude that . . . retention of the original orthography is the only objective solution in such cases (La Cépède, de Buen, de la Roche, etc.) ".

Dr. George S. Myers (*Stanford University, California*) (then President of the ASIH, and as such, *ex-officio* member of the Committee) : " For whatever effect it may have upon the recommendations of the Committee on Zoological Nomenclature of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, I wish to protest strongly against any existing or future rule that requires changing the spelling of an already published generic or trivial name for any reason save a printer's error in the name at the original place of proposal. The new section of the *Règles* which allows corrections of spelling on philological and perhaps other grounds will cause a great deal of trouble in producing unnecessary homonyms in generic names, and I am hoping that this section may be repealed or eliminated. Moreover, I can see no good reason to disturb trivial patronymics because different namers have spelt the name of the person ' honored ' differently. Some of the persons so honored have not themselves been consistent in spelling their own names, and the safest rule for the zoologist is to follow the originally proposed spelling of a name ".

Dr. Hobart M. Smith (*University of Illinois, Urbana*) *:* " Obviously a decision regarding French will be a stepping stone to decisions on Spanish and, more confusingly, to Dutch and other names (as for example Van der Hoeven, Van Denburgh, etc.). Taxonomists should not be expected to be critics of what part or parts of the surnominal article are to be accepted, and which rejected, or even whether they should *always* be either accepted or rejected ".

Mr. Norman J. Wilimovsky (*Stanford University, California*) *:* " I wish to make it clear in the beginning that I definitely oppose any form of correction with names of the *lacepedei/cepedi* types. I base my objection on a number of reasons, perhaps the strongest being that any trivial name can be considered nothing more than a combination of letters. If we start digging back into older works to begin correcting names I'm afraid that more confusion will result than stability. With regard to patronymics I feel the author should decide on just how it is to be formed ".

Excerpts from letters received from all specialists who replied to the Committee's request for advice are the following :

Dr. Reeve M. Bailey (*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.*) *:* " I personally have no strong feelings on the subject, so will be glad of any clear-cut decision . . . My preference is for emendation—thus, we could remember merely the simple manner of formation of genitive patronymics and know how to spell any name of this character. The only difficulty for me is knowing what is (or is not) part of the name—we could call it the de la Roche dilemma (*delarochei, larochei* or *rochei* ?) ".

Dr. Carl L. Hubbs (*University of California, La Jolla*) *:* " I have your copies of correspondence regarding what action should be taken in respect to names of the *lacepedei/cepedei* type. It seems to me that this argument over such a really ' trivial ' case is a very strong argument for not tampering with the rule of following the original spelling, right or wrong . . . In any event, in this special case I think we should very strongly urge that the older names be not changed except under very simple and understandable conditions. Perhaps a rule could be made obligatory for the future, but I do not think it should be for the past. The question of whether or not the article in the family name should be used or deleted is certainly a complicated one. The degree to which the article is or is not a part of the name varies greatly in different languages, at different times, and no doubt for different families. Just why we cannot allow the author of a name to decide questions of this sort is beyond me. I feel sure that in this special case we will run into a whole string of new complexities if we do not follow the principle of complying with the original spelling. Otherwise we will have the problem of deciding whether or not the man involved usually did or did not use the article with his name, whether the article was capitalised, whether the article was combined with the rest of the name, etc. . . . Another very major difficulty will be in deciding often for whom a species was named, and how that presumed person spelled his name. Probably a majority of authors do not actually indicate the etymology of their specific names ".

Mr. John Treadwell Nichols (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York City*) *:* " I have had names ' corrected ' by an editor, and of course followed them as published, but it was annoying, as they did not so well serve my purpose or intention . . . Where two names are different they are rated as different by me, except where one might be made by legitimate change of gender, or proved misprint—that they may mean the same thing and one might be ' corrected ' into the other on the basis of someone's whim or opinion has nothing to do with it ".

Dr. Leonard P. Schultz (*United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.*) *:* " It seems to me that the problem is solvable under the already existing rules of zoological nomenclature. Since we have been using for over fifty years the exact spelling originally used, I would prefer to follow that system and make no rule that would accept any special spelling ".

CASE NO. 13

ARTICLE 14: PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED WHEN FORMING A TRIVIAL NAME BASED EITHER (1) UPON THE NAME OF A MODERN PERSONAGE WHERE THAT NAME IS PRECEDED BY A NOBILIAR PARTICLE OR (2) UPON THE NAME OF A CHRISTIAN SAINT

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)740)

DOCUMENT 13/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

It will be remembered that at Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had under consideration a composite proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (*Université de Toulouse*) dealing with a considerable number of points arising in connection with the formation of trivial names (Article 14). This proposal, to which Professor Bonnet had given the title " Proposition 5 " was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 181–182).

2. Decisions were reached on all the matters raised in Professor Bonnet's Proposition 5 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 200–209).

3. This question is however raised again here, in order to provide an opportunity for considering whether it is desirable that a qualifying *Recommandation* should be added in the case of two of the matters then dealt with. These are the procedures to be followed in forming a trivial name based either (i) upon the name of a modern personage, where that name is preceded by a nobiliar particle or (ii) upon the name of a Christian Saint. For in each available material suggests that, in the absence of a warning of this kind, an author forming trivial names of the foregoing types is liable to fall into error.

4. As regards the first of the foregoing types of trivial name, it was decided that the nobiliar particle should be omitted, the correct form for a trivial name based upon the name of a man bearing the name " de Lessert " being *lessrti* not *delessrti* (see 1950, *ibid.* **4**: 207–208, Point (3) (a)). In the case of trivial names based upon the names of Christian Saints it was decided that the adjective " Sanctus " or its equivalent should be omitted, the correct form of a trivial name based (for example) upon the name of St. Remy being thus *remyi* not *sanctiremyi* (see 1950, *ibid.* **4**: 207, Point (2) (c)).

5. The difficulty which is now seen to arise is how in certain cases to determine, in the first case, whether, where the name of a modern personage consists of two or more words, the first part is, in fact, a nobiliar particle, and,

in the second case, whether a given particle has the meaning that the person, to whose name that particle is attached, was a Christian Saint. Examples of these difficulties are provided in the notes furnished (a) by the late Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (Document 13/2) and by Senor Angel Cabrera (Document 13/3).

6. In view of the evident difficulties involved in forming names of these two classes, it is suggested for consideration that it might be advantageous to replace the Paris provisions with the following new provisions :—

(1) *New provision :* Where it is desired to base a trivial name upon a patronymic which consists of two words, of which the first (1) may be a nobiliar particle, or (2) may indicate that the name is that of a Christian Saint, the particle may be either included in, or excluded from, the trivial name so formed.

(2) Suggested new " Recommandation " : Where it is clear in such a case that the first word of the patronymic concerned (i) is a nobiliar particle or (ii) is intended to denote that the person concerned has been canonised as a Christian Saint, it is recommended that the particle should be omitted.

DOCUMENT 13/2

By the late **LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO** (*University of Parma, Italy*)

Statement received on 19th January, 1948

PROPOSAL 5 OF PROF. BONNET (PROPOSAL TO MODIFY PARAGRAPH C OF ART. 14 GIVING MORE DETAILED RULES ON THE WAY TO FORM TRIVIAL NAMES DEDICATED TO ONE OR MORE PERSONS

I agree, for sake of uniformity, with the first paragraphs of proposal 5, concerning the way of forming the genitive form. With proposal 5, 3° telling that " in the names having a separable nobiliar particule (de, du, del, di, do, van, von etc.) this must be abolished " I cannot agree, because it is almost impossible to know when a separate particule is a nobiliar particule and when it is an integral part of the name. In Italy for instance, there exist familiar names like Di Vestea, D'Onofrio, which are quite different names from the, top existing, family names Vestea, Onofrio ; in such cases, it is a real mistake to supprime the particule. On the other hand, if it is possible for me, being an Italian, to know whether a particule is a nobiliar (and therefore supprimable) one or one, which is an integral part of the name, in Italian names, it is impossible for me to know that in the other languages, and such is the case for every one. The best proof of it is given by Prof. Bonnet himself, because in the list of examples which he gives, there is a mistake : Bonnet tells that a trivial name dedicated to Del Pino must be *pinoi* : but, the particule Del of Del Pino is not a nobiliar particule ; it is an integral part of the name and to call a species *pinoi* after Del Pino would be exactly the same mistake as to call species *neti* from Bonnet.

The same must be said for the names compound with San, Saint etc. (prop 5,5° of Prof. Bonnet). San Marzano is a quite different family name from Marzano and so forth.

I think it impossible to give a rule valuable in each case ; moreover, it seems to me that it is a thing of little value if someone dedicates a species of a genus a to de Lessert and calls it *delesserti* and another author dedicates a species of another genus to de Lessert calling it *lesserti* ; the important thing is that species *A. delesserti*, once named so, must always be called *delessarti* and not *lesserti* and not become *delesserti*.

At any rate, I think that it is well to prescribe explicitly that the names with a separable particule or the names with San, Saint etc. fall under the rule of proposal 7 of Prof. Bonnet and must be written in a single word.

DOCUMENT 13/3

COMMENT ON POINT (5) IN PROFESSOR PIERRE BONNET'S PROPOSITION 5

By **ANGEL CABRERA** (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*)

Extract from a letter dated 26th June, 1952

Please find herewith a rectification of a little slip of a linguistic character in a proposed clarification of the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the formation of names.

Annexe Dr. Angel Cabrera's letter

A PROPOSED RECTIFICATION

In *Bull. Z. N.*, 3 : 182 (Proposed clarification of Article 14 of the *Règles*) it is said, paragr. 5 :

" Corrélativement, tous les noms composés avec Saint, Sainte, Sanct, San, etc. no doivent pas voir de préfixe figurer dans leur nom : SAINT REMY : *rémyi*. SANZ DE DIEGO : *diegoi*.

The last example involves a mistake. The Spanish word " Sanz " is not a prefix similar to Saint, Sainte, etc. It is a family name by itself, like Saez, Saenz or Sanchez, without a meaning of sanctity. Sanz de Diego is a combination of two names, similar to the French " Gadeau de Kerville " or to the Spanish " Jiménez de la Espada ". A species named after Sanz de Diego may be either *sanzi* or *diegoi*.

CASE No. 14

ARTICLE 14 : PROPOSED REGULARISATION OF THE STATUS OF TRIVIAL NAMES BASED ON MODERN PATRONYMICS, WHEN FORMED AS ADJECTIVES

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)661)

DOCUMENT 14/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

The present wording of the portion (paragraph (3)) of Article 14 which relates to the formation of trivial names when based upon modern patronymics is ambiguous, in that it implies—or appears to imply—that, where a trivial name is based upon a modern patronymic, the only permissible way in which to form that name is to add the appropriate genitival ending to the complete name of the person (or persons) after whom the species in question is named. It is quite clear, however, that this cannot have been the intention of the draftsman of this part of Article 14, in view of the large number of trivial names based upon modern patronymics which have been formed not as noun substantives in the genitive case (such as *smithi*) but as adjectives (such as *smithianus*).

2. This ambiguity has been brought to my attention by a number of correspondents and is one which, I suggest, should be rectified. The proposal now submitted is :—

(1) that Article 14 should be amended to provide that a trivial name may be based upon the name of a modern personage, either (i) as a noun in the genitive case or (ii) as an adjective ;

(2) that a *Recommandation* should be added in favour of the formation of such names as nouns rather than as adjectives ;

The foregoing provisions would then be followed by the provision regarding the form of genitive endings for such nouns which was substituted for the former paragraph (3) of this Article at Paris in 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 205–206, Point (1) (b)).

3. It will be recalled that in his note on the question of emending names, which has been included in the present volume (:89) as Document 5/15, Mr. C. W. Wright suggested that the *Règles* should be clarified in the sense suggested above.

CASE NO. 15

ARTICLE 14 : QUESTION WHETHER IT IS DESIRABLE THAT TRIVIAL NAMES BASED UPON MODERN PATRONYMICS IN THE GENITIVE SINGULAR AND INCORRECTLY FORMED WITH A TERMINAL DOUBLE " II " SHOULD, AS DECIDED IN PARIS IN 1948, BE SUBJECT TO AUTOMATIC CORRECTION

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)705)

DOCUMENT 15/1

Introductory Note by **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

At its meeting held in Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature recommended, and the Thirteenth International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature agreed, that, where a trivial name based upon a modern patronymic is formed in the genitive singular and, notwithstanding the explicit provisions of Article 14 (third paragraph) a double " -ii " instead of a single " -i " is added to the name of the person in whose honour the species is named, this contravention of the foregoing provision shall be subject to automatic correction (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 67–68). At the same time the International Commission cancelled as incorrect its *Opinion* 8 in which an opposite view had been taken.

2. Since 1948 the Paris ruling has been applied in all cases submitted to the International Commission. As regards one of these, however, an objection to the foregoing ruling has been received. The case in question is one submitted by Dr. C. J. Stubblefield and is concerned with the proposed use of the plenary powers to vary the type species of the trilobite genus *Cummingella* Reed, 1842 (Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)409) ; the species which it was there proposed should be designated as the type species was originally published as *Phillipsia jonesii* (by Portlock in 1843). In commenting on this application, Professor Rudolf Richter indicated his support of the action proposed but took strong objection to the correction of the trivial name from *jonesii* to *jonesi*.

3. Professor Richter's communication is annexed as Document 15/2. It is not possible to accept as valid Professor Richter's argument that the provision discussed above should be regarded as optional in character, for, if this had been so, it would have been incorporated in the *Règles* as a *Recommandation* and not as part of the mandatory provisions. Nevertheless, careful consideration needs to be given to what is, in effect, Professor Richter's main contention, namely that, having regard to the long use of many trivial names incorrectly formed with a terminal double " -ii ", it would be contrary to the interests of stability to require that all names incorrectly formed in this way should be corrected, so as to comply with the requirements of Article 14.

4. If the foregoing view were to be taken and it was accordingly decided to review the decision taken in Paris on this subject, the following questions would call for decision :—

(1) If names incorrectly formed with a terminal double " -ii " are to be exempt from automatic correction, if published before a certain date, what date should be fixed for this purpose ? Should it be (say) 1st January, 1950, the nearest convenient date to that on which the Paris decision was published or the date of the Copenhagen Congress or some date subsequent thereto ?

(2) Since the object of modifying the Paris decision in this matter would be the promotion of stability in nomenclature, what safeguards should be introduced to prevent the suggested change from having the exactly opposite effect in those cases where the currently accepted form for a given trivial name is not the incorrect form with a terminal double " -ii " in which it was originally published but the corrected form with a single terminal " -i " ?

(3) If in the interests of stability the trivial names based on modern patronymics originally published incorrectly with a terminal double " -ii " are not be to subject to correction, if published before a certain date, what action, if any, is it desirable should be taken in the parallel case where a name of the foregoing type is incorrectly formed by reason of the fact that the patronymic in question is not embodied unchanged in the trivial name based upon it ? An example of a name of this class is provided by the name *Phillipsia kellii* Portlock, 1843, a name which purports to have been given in honour of a man named Kelly ; this name is chosen as an example because it happens to occur in the same application by Dr. Stubblefield as that referred to by Professor Richter in Document 15/2. If this aspect of Article 14 is to be dealt with, the questions raised in (1) and (2) above will each call for consideration in connection with it.

DOCUMENT 15/2

By **RUDOLF RICHTER** (*Senckenbergische Naturforschende Gessellschaft, Senckenberg Anlage, Frankfurt a.M.*)

Memorandum dated 5th September, 1952

STELLUNGNAHME ZU DEN VORSCHLAGEN VON DR. C. J. STUBBLEFIELD (Z.N.(S.)409) IN BULL. ZOOL. NOMENCLATURE, 6, 5 : 150 LONDON, 15 APRIL, 1952

Die Vorschläge sind gut begründet und zweckmässig. Ihre Annahme wird einen Fortschritt im Sinne der Stabilität der Nomenklatur bedeuten.

Nur die *Schreibweise* der Art-Namen erfordert eine Bemerkung.

Die Art jonesii 1843 wird in dem Antrag jonesi geschrieben. Das ist im strengen Sinne nicht korrekt, da der Artikel 14 IZRN, der die Endung -i statt -ii vorschreibt, erst für solche Namen gilt, die *nach* 1905 aufgestellt werden. Denn auch in der Nomenklatur sind *rückwirkende Gesetze immer illegal.* Es entstehen jedoch in diesem Falle keine schädlichen Folgen für die Nomenklatur, da nach den Gutachten zu Artikel 14 die Endungen -i und -ii zu den *fakultativen Varianten* gehören, die man ohne nomenklatorische Folgen *nebeneinander* gebrauchen darf.

Dagegen ist die nachträgliche Anderung des Art-Namens kellii PORTLOCK 1843 in kellyi abzulehnen, obwohl nach Artikel 34, 35 IZRN auch hierdurch nur fakultative Varianten entstehen. Aber die Duldung einer solchen Anderung wurde schädliche Folgen für die Stabilität der Nomenklatur haben. Denn wenn man PORTLOCK nachträglich das Recht abspricht, den Paten-Namen KELLY in KELLIUS zu latinisieren und von KELLIUS den Art-Namen kellii (statt kellyi) zu bilden, so muss das logischer Weise auch in vielen anderen Fällen tun. Man kommt dann ohne Grenze zu immer schwereren Anderungen : So hat z.B. DE KONINCK 1841 den Paten-Namen GOLDFUSS in GOLDIUS latinisiert und abgekürzt ; dementsprechend hat er den Gattungs-Namen Goldius gebildet. Wollte man anfangen, " unerlaubte " Latinisierungen des Paten-Namens zu " berichtigen ", so müsste man auch den Gattungs-Namen Goldius zu Goldfussius und einen Art-Namen goldius zu goldfussius emendieren. Das ist nur ein Probefall für solche unnötigen Anderungen von Tier-Namen†.

Aber auch Tier-Namen, die *nach* 1905 aufgestellt worden sind, sollte man nicht nach Artikel 14c *nachträglich* " berichtigen ", wenn der Autor einen Paten-Namen latinisiert oder sonst in freier Weise umgebildet hat. So ist z.B. der Name des Paten QUIRING (auf dessen Wunsch) von DAHMER zu QUIRINUS latinisiert und davon nach 1905 der Name quirini abgeleitet worden. Wird ein Revisor wirklich den Mut haben, quirini in quiringi zu ändern und dadurch vielleicht auch noch einen älteren Namen quiringi zu erschüttern ?

---

† Vgl. RUD. RICHTER : Schutz der Tier-Namen vor Emendation.—Senckenbergiana, *32* : 357, 1952.

Nach dem Geiste der Regeln will die philologische Vorschrift, die Artikel 14 im letzten Absatz über die Ableitung des Art-Namens von einem Paten-Namen nur eine Befreiung von dem Zwang zu einer lateinischen Deklination sein. Artikel 14 will keine Quelle nachträglicher Anderungen sein.

Wird der Artikel 14 dennoch zu einer Schädigung der Stabilität missbraucht, dann müsste das durch eine eindeutige Fassung verhütet werden, entsprechend der von grossen Gesellschaften geforderten Präambel : " Wenn eine Bestimmung der Regeln mit dem Prinzip der Stabilität in Widerspruch steht, so ist es die Pflicht der Internationalen Kommission die Anderung der betreffenden Bestimmung herbeizuführen. Denn die Namen sind wichtiger als die Nomenklatur.*

Die Pariser Beschlüsse, die obiger Antrag für gültig hält, haben in Wirklichkeit keine Gültigkeit.

---

* Antrag an die Internationale Kommission fur Zoologische Nomenklatur Senckenbergiana *33* : 193, 1952.

CASE NO. 16

ARTICLE 14 (OR ASSOCIATED ARTICLE) : QUESTION OF THE GENDER ATTRIBUTABLE TO GENERIC NAMES CONSISTING OF COMPOUND WORDS OF GREEK OR LATIN ORIGIN

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)440)

DOCUMENT 16/1

Introductory Note by **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

The annexed correspondence is concerned with the question of the gender to be attributed to a generic name consisting of a compound word of Greek or Latin origin, a subject of importance for the purpose of complying with the provisions of the first paragraph of Article 14, on which however the *Règles* at present provide no guidance.

2. This question was raised by Dr. Reeve M. Bailey (*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*) (in a letter dated 1st December, 1949) in relation to the gender to be applied to the generic name *Notropis* Rafinesque, 1818, a genus comprising a large group of American cyprinid fishes. Dr. Bailey's letter is annexed as Document 16/2. The issue raised by Dr. Bailey clearly called, in the first instance, for advice from some eminent Greek scholar and I accordingly consulted Professor L. W. Grensted, D.D. (*Oriel College, Oxford*), who on previous occasions had been so good as to place his knowledge at the disposal of the International Commission. The extremely interesting and informative reply received from Professor Grensted is annexed as Document 16/3.

3. In the light of the information so received, for which the Commission is much indebted to Professor Grensted, it is possible to devise as follows a provision which would give an answer to the question raised by Dr. Bailey and to all similar cases when they arise :—

> The gender of generic names consisting of compound words of Greek or Latin origin is to be determined as follows :—
>
> (a) Where one of the comprised words is an adjective and the other a noun, the gender of the generic name is whatever may be the gender of the noun.

(b) Where both the comprised words are nouns and one of those nouns is a noun with verbal force, the gender of the generic name is whatever may be the gender of the noun having verbal force.

(c) Where both the comprised words are nouns and neither has a verbal force, the gender of the generic name is whatever may be the gender of the first of the two nouns concerned, save exceptionally where, as in the name *Hippopotamus*, it is evident that the first noun is primary and the second strictly adjectival.

(d) Where there are reasonable grounds for believing that the gender of a word composing a generic name cannot be correctly determined in accordance with the foregoing rules, the case should be submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision.

3. In the particular case of the name *Notropis* Rafinesque, on which the present general problem was raised by Dr. Reeve Bailey, it appears from Professor Grensted's letter (1) that it is highly probable that the correct gender of the word " Notropis " is feminine, but (2) that the possibility of its being neuter or (less probably) masculine cannot be excluded. There is therefore an element of doubt in this matter which would make it possible for the International Commission to give a ruling without invoking its plenary powers. Accordingly, if it is the general wish of ichthyologists that the traditional use of the masculine gender should be continued for the name *Notropis* Rafinesque, it would be open to the International Commission, if it so thought fit, to give a ruling in this sense, the name *Notropis* Rafinesque being at the same time placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

DOCUMENT 16/2

By **REEVE M. BAILEY**

(*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*)

Letter dated 1st December, 1949

Recently there has developed a problem which, although minor, is potentially a source of much annoyance and confusion. I appeal to your experience with the International Commisssion as to the best method for handling this matter.

In 1818 Rafinesque (*Amer. Month. Mag.*, 2 : 204) established a new genus *Notropis* on the basis of a single new species, named by him *atherinoides*. This appears to be the oldest generic name for a large group of American cyprinid fishes. It has long been believed by ichthyologists that the derivation of the name *Notropis* is from *notus* (*νωτος*), masculine, the back and *tropis* (*τροπις*), feminine, keel. Following a free translation, keeled-back, the name would be masculine, but a friend who is a classicist, assures me that the terminal element (*tropis*) determines gender, and thus *Notropis* should be regarded as feminine. Several of us have been aware of this for several years but have disregarded it and have followed common practice : ichthyologists in the past, without important exception, have treated *Notropis* as masculine. Now however one of my distinguished colleagues, who is in a puristic frame of mind, proposed to revert to the classical feminine for *Notropis*. If the genus were small or insignificant this action would seem wise, but unfortunately *Notropis* is the largest genus of North American fresh-water fishes, including well over 100 species and in excess of 150 species and subspecies. Also, many of the most abundant and widely distributed of our smaller fishes are included. The terminations of dozens of names such as *cornutus*, *rubellus*, *volucellus*, *zonatus*, *bellus* and *maculatus* will have to be changed if this proposed innovation is followed.

The problem is whether (1) to make the change and treat *Notropis* as feminine forthwith, (2) to disregard the matter entirely as has been done in the past and continue to treat *Notropis* as masculine, or (3) to petition the International Commission to permit us, through plenary action, to treat *Notropis* as masculine.

As indicated above this is a minor point but the confusion attending change would further alienate taxonomists from those other biologists who deal with animal names and who long for stability.

DOCUMENT 16/3

By **L. W. GRENSTED,** D.D. (*Oriel College, Oxford*)

Letter dated 22nd December, 1949

Gender of generic names which are compound words of Greek or Latin origin

The whole business seems to me to bristle with special cases, owing to the queer compounds that have been published, but the following principles hold :—

(1) If one part of the name is an adjective, of the other a noun, no question arises. The gender of the noun obviously dominates.

(2) If one part of the name is a noun with verbal force, governing the other noun (e.g., *Melophagus*, *Limnophila*) the gender will normally be that of the noun with verbal force. But irregular formations such as *Philhydrus* would have to be considered individually. Here in fact the " *Phil-*" is not so much a noun as a verbal stem, and the whole word is a compound adjective, masculine in form.

(3) If both parts are derived from nouns which are not verbal in force (as in the case of *Notropis*), the first will, in all rightly formed names, be adjectival to the second (I know of no exception to this in Greek except ἱπποποταμος, which is generally regarded as a monstrosity, and which may very possibly have a special explanation—since the original name of the hippopotamus was ἱππος ποταμιος and there is evidence from a papyrus that this was sometimes contracted to ἱπποποταμις, whence the change to ἱπποποταμος is easy. Therefore in all rightly formed names the gender will be the gender of the second noun, and this principle should be followed wherever possible. The gender should only go with the first noun where there is indisputable evidence that it is primary and that the second noun is strictly adjectival. I cannot think of an example of this, except *Hippopotamus*, and it certainly makes for simplicity if the second noun controls the gender.

(4) Accepting the above principle *Notropis* must be feminine, and this is of course the natural gender in any case for a noun in " -is ". But the detailed analysis of the name is interesting, as follows :—

(5) I do not know whether Rafinesque gave any clue, but, assuming the usual examination of the name, all three genders are possible, feminine being far the most probable, and neuter, of the other two, more probable than masculine. The proper form of the name would, of course, have been *Nototropis*,

that does not affect the question of gender. The contraction to *Notropis* does, however, suggest that " tropis ", the one complete element, is the dominant one. The Greek words concerned are νωτον or νωτος and τροπις, the latter being feminine. The neuter νωτον is far commoner than the masculine νωτος. In the early poets and in Attic Greek the word is always neuter, and the only important passages to set against this are two in Aristotle's *Historia Animalium*, where the accusative νωτον is made to agree with a masculine adjective. The nominative νωτος seems not to be found at all. If therefore the first element in *Notropis* determines the gender it should be neuter !

(6) But there is not need to stress the first element. The name just means " back-keel " which is quite as descriptive as " keel-back ". It indicates fishes with dorsal keels, just as " red-shank " is combined to denote a bird with red legs, " ox-eye " a daisy like an ox's eye, and " thread-fin " a fish with thread-like fins. I suppose that these forms (none of which is exactly parallel to the others) are really noun-forms in apposition to a supposed subject. In the case of word *Notropis* it is perfectly natural to take the tropis or keel as the determinative element, the keel indicated having the character of being on the back of the fish. I can see no reason why the word should not follow the natural indication of its termination and be feminine.

PURCHASED
23 AUG 1955

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

Temporary postponement of publication of Triple Part 3/5

Technical production difficulties have led to a temporary postponement of the publication of Triple Part 3/5, which contains the series of papers received on the subject of the emendation of names. This Part, which contains pages 61–166 of the present volume, will, however, it is hoped, be published at a very early date.

Printed in England by Metcalfe & Cooper Limited, 10-24 Scrutton St., London E C 2

VOLUME 10. Part 8
Pp. 231—262

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

23rd July, 1953

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Copenhagen Discussions, Cases 17–25 : Cases relating to Articles 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, and 23 of the " Règles "

LONDON:
Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1953

Price Twelve Shillings and Sixpence

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Part 8 (pp. 231–262) 23rd July, 1953

CASE NO. 17

ARTICLE 15 : PROPOSED AMPLIFICATION OF THE PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE FORMATION OF TRIVIAL NAMES CONSISTING OF COMPOUND WORDS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)390)

DOCUMENT 17/1

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse*)

Editorial Note : The following application was submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in 1948 but at the Paris Session was deferred for later consideration (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 209–212). The present application was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 185–187), but, in view of its complexity, it does not lend itself to being summarised, and it is now reprinted in full. (Intl'd.) F.H. 20th May, 1953.

. . . .

PROPOSITION 8

Ajouter trois articles $15^{\text{bis, ter, quater}}$, sur la façon de former les most spécifiques composés.

Article 15^{bis}.—*Les noms spécifiques, composés, formés de deux mots grecs ou de deux mots latins, deviennent généralement des adjectifs ; le deuxième terme, seul déclinable, s'accorde avec le nom générique. Ils peuvent être formés :*

(1) par la juxtaposition à un adjectif d'une préposition, d'un préfixe courant ou d'un adjectif numéral invariable (*subaequalis, pseudomonticola, unicornis, bimaculatus, triguttatus, decemnotatus, vigintipunctatus*).

Recommandation : L'adjectif numéral en composition avec un adjectif s'écrit en toutes lettres ; on ne doit pas écrire 10-*notatus*, 13-*guttatus*, 18-*punctatus*. (Car beaucoup de personnes ne sauraient peut-être pas prononcer sur le moment *decemnotatus*, *tredecimguttatus* ou *duodevigintipunctatus*, ce qui est essentiel).

(2) par la juxtaposition de deux adjectifs, le premier étant réuni au deuxiéme par une voyelle de liaison *o* ou *i* (*fuscorufus*, *albogilvus*, *rubicoloratus*.

Recommandation : C'est l'oreille qui guide dans le choix de cette voyelle de liaison ; quand un mot supporte l'une ou l'autre (*albomaculata*, *albimaculata*), il vaut mieux mettre " *o* ".

(3) par juxtaposition d'un adjectif à un substantif réuni à lui par une voyelle de liaison : l'ensemble devient un mot adjectivé qui peut avoir :

(a) une seule forme invariable pour les trois genres (*longipes*, *melanogaster*, et tous les mots composés avec *pes*, *frons*, *dens*, *thorax*, *ceps*, *gaster*, *color*, etc. . . .)

(b) une forme déclinable de la première classe (*quadrimanus*, *a*, *um ; melanocephalus*, *a*, *um ;* et tous les mots composés avec *manus*, *carpus*, *tarsus*, *barbus*, *spinus*, *comus*, *stylus*, *ophthalmus*, etc. . . .)

(c) une forme déclinable de la deuxième classe *flavipalpis*, *e ; tenuitarsis*, *e ;* et tous les mots composés avec *palpis*, *tarsis*, *barbis*, *rostris*, *cornis*, *ventris*, *collis*, *formis*, etc. . . .)

Recommandation : Quand un terme supporte d'être un adjectif de la Ière ou de la 2ème classe (*longitarsus* ou *longitarsis ; flavipalpus* ou *flavopalpis ; rufibarbus* ou *rufobarbis*) il vaut mieux prendre la forme en *is*, *e*, qui a été la plus employée.

(4) par juxtaposition de deux substantifs :

(a) le premier, complément de l'autre, se met au génitif ; de deuxième, considéré comme apposition, est au nominatif (*tauricornu*, *equisetum*, *menthaefolia*).

(b) l'inversion peut ne pas exister, et, de ce fait, le mos composé a une terminaison au génitif (*densleonis*, *cornucopiae*, *cornupastoris*).

(c) mais le deuxième nom peut prendre une forme adjective, et dans ce cas il s'accorde avec le nom générique (*vermiformis*, *e* ; *ferrequinus*, *a*, *um ;* etc. . . .)

(5) par juxtaposition d'un verbe et d'un substantif ; le substantif est devant le verbe, réuni à lui par une voyelle de liaison ; le verbe prend une forme adjective déclinable.

(a) les verbes *genere*, *fugere*, *vorare*, *gradi*, *vagari* donnent des formes en *us*, *a*, *um* (*genus*, *a*, *um ; fugus*, *a*, *um ; vorus*, *gradus*, *vagus*) (Examples: *montigenus*, *lucifugus*, *omnivorus*, *herbigradus*, *montivagus*).

(b) les verbes *gerere* et *ferre* donnent des formes *ger*, *a*, *um* et *fer*, *a*, *um*, (Exemple : *crucifer*, *a*, *um ; dentiger*, *a*, *um;*). Les formes *gerus* et *ferus* sont très incorrectes, et ne doivent pas être employées.

(c) le verbe *colere* donne la forme invariable *cola* (*silvicola, agricola, monticola, floricola, ruricola,* etc. . . .).—C'est donc une erreur que d'accorder ces termes avec le nom générique, on ne doit pas dire *silvicolus,* ni *agricolum,* etc. . . .

(d) les verbes grecs *phoreo* (je porte) et *phileo* (j'aime) donnent des terminaisons latinisées en *phorus, a, um,* et *philus, a, um* (*stylophorus, a, um ; hydrophilus, a um*) Les formes en *phoreus* et *phileus* sont à rejeter.

Recommandation générale : Dans la formation de ces mots composés il est formellement interdit de former des mots hybrides en combinant un mot latin et un mot grec : *nigrocephalus, isopes* etc. . . . ne sont pas admissibles. Cependant si certains de ces hybrides ont été formes et employés sans que personne n'ait jamais songé à les rectifier, il y a lieu de les conserver aujourd'hui en application de l'article 32.

Article 15^ter^.—*Dans la composition de ces mots composés, l'hiatus doit toujours être évité.*

L'hiatus est très désagréable à l'orielle et les romains en avaient horreur ; il faut donc l'éviter autant qu'il est possible.—On supprime l'hiatus :

(a) par la syncope de la voyelle finale du premier terme, ou de la voyelle de liaison ; mais on ne touche jamais à la première lettre du deuxieme terme :

pseudoagricola	doit	deveuir	*pseudoagricola*
quadriangulatus	,,	,,	*quadrangulatus*
nigroolivacea	,,	,,	*nigrolivacea*
Pseudoicius	,,	,,	*Pseudicius*

(" *Microorganisme* " est un mot affreux que l'on doit remplacer par " *microrganisme* ".)

(b) par l'introduction d'une lettre euphonique entre les deux voyelles de l'hiatus :
reemptus devient *redemptus ; reimitus* devient *redimitus*
(Le terme " prolandrie " pour " proandrie " est très bien formé).

Article 15^quater^.—*Dans les mots composés avec une lettre qui rappele un signe d'ornementation, il y a lieu d'indiquer, entre crochets, la prononciation de cette lettre grecque ou latine.*

[*lambda*]-*signata ; m*[*ém*]-*nigrum ; x*[*iks*]-*notatus.* Ici le trait d'union doit être maintenu.

DOCUMENT 17/2

By the late **LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO** (*University of Parma, Italy*)

Statement received on 19th January, 1948

PROPOSAL NO. 8 OF PROF. BONNET (PROPOSAL TO ADD ARTICLES 15 BIS, 15 TER, 15 QUATER SPECIFYING THE MANNER OF FORMING COMPOUND TRIVIAL NAMES)

I agree with Art. 15 bis to 15 ter.

For Art. 15 quater (" in compound names, formed with a letter which recalls an ornamental sign, this pronunciation of that greek or latin letter must be put in brackets, for instance *(lambda)-signata* ; *m(em)-nigrum* ; *x(iks)-notatus* ") I think it is much more simple to replace it by the following : " In trivial names compound with a letter which denotes an ornamental sign, this letter must be indicated exclusively by its latin or greek name, f. inst. lambda-signata, mem-nigrum, iksnotatus."

CASE NO. 18

ARTICLE 16 : PROPOSED ADDITION OF A "RECOMMANDATION" RELATING TO THE FORMATION OF TRIVIAL NAMES BASED UPON THE GEOGRAPHICAL TERMS AND HAVING THE TERMINATION "-ENSIS"

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)391)

DOCUMENT 18/1

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse, France*)

Editorial Note : The following application was submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in 1948 but at the Paris Session was deferred for later consideration (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 209—212). The present application was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 197), but, as it is quite short, it is here reprinted for convenience of reference. (Intl'd.) F.H. 20th May, 1953.

. . . .

PROPOSITION 15

Ajouter à l'article 16 une nouvelle recommandation sur le formation des adjectifs géographiques en "*-ensis*".

Article 16—Recommandation : *Pour former les adjectifs géographiqes en "-ensis," au nom latinisé (ou non) des pays et des villes ajouter ce suffixe "-ensis " si le nom se termine par une consonne, et s'il se termine par une voyelle remplacer cette voyelle par "-ensis." Exemples :*

Timor : timorensis
Burdigala : burdigalensis
Massilia : massiliensis
Paraguay : paraguayensis
Tirol : tirolenis
Canada : canadensis
Brasilia : brasiliensis
Guadeloupe : guadeloupensis

Explication : Cette recommandation est necessaire, car de nombrèaux auteurs ne savent que faire en l'occurence, et il importe par cette règle très simple de montrer que l'on ne doit par dire *canadiensis*, ni *brasilensis*. Finalement, la terminaison en"*-iensis*," n'existe que s'il y a déjà un " *i* " dans la terminaison du nom géographique.

DOCUMENT 18/2

By the late **LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO** (*University of Parma, Italy*)

Statement received on 19th January, 1948

PROPOSAL N. 15 OF PROF. BONNET TO ADD TO ART. 16 A RECOMMANDATION UPON THE FORMATION OF TRIVIAL NAMES FROM GEOGRAPHICAL ADJECTIVES ENDING IN *ENSIS*

I fully agree for reasons of grammar and uniformity.

CASE NO. 19

ARTICLE 16 : PROPOSED AMPLIFICATION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE FORMATION OF TRIVIAL NAMES BASED UPON GEOGRAPHICAL TERMS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)536)

DOCUMENT 19/1

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse, France*)

Paper received on 14th August, 1951

Editorial Note : Prior to submission to the International Commission, the following paper had been published in 1950 (*Bull. Soc. Hist. nat. Toulouse* **85**(1/2) : 63–66).

. . . .

La diversité de structure des noms spécifiques formés à partir de vocables géographiques est telle que je crois devoir l'aborder pour tâcher de déterminer les formes correctes.

Les Règles de Nomenclature disent dans leur article 16 : " Les noms géographiques conservent la forme substantive et sont mis au génitif ou bien sont transformés en adjectifs. Exemples : *sancti pauli*, *sanctae helenae*, *edwardiensis*, *diemensis*, *magellanicus*, *burdigalensis*, *vindobonensis*. " —D'autre part, à l'article 14 figurent aussi les exemples *antillarum* et *galliae* et l'on cite à l'article 15 : *janmayeni*.

Si l'énoncé de cette règle est parfait et si les premiers exemples sont corrects, je n'en dirai pas autant de *antillarum* et *janmayeni ;* ce sont certainement ces deux termes qui ont permis par la suite la formation de vocables tout à fait incorrects, comme nous allons le voir.

Quand il existe des noms géographiques latins, rien n'est aussi facile que d'employer ces substantifs, comme noms d'espèce, au génitif (*galliae*, *hispaniae*, *italiae*, *germaniae*, *luteciae*, *romae*, *burdigalae*, *massilae*, *pyrenaei* ou *pyrenaeorum*, *athenarum*, etc. . . .) on encore des adjectifs dérivés, soit en *icus* (*gallicus*, *italicus*, *germanicus*, *pyrenaicus*), soit en *anus* ou *inus* (*tolosanus*, *lutetianus*, *algerinus*, *alpinus*), soit en *ensis* ou *iensis* (*burdigalensis*, *massiliensis*, *atheniensis*) (¹).

(¹) Au sujet de ces adjectifs en *ensis*, *iensis*, j'ai déjà exprimé dans *Bibliographia Araneorum*, t. I, p. 132, la règle permettant d'employer l'une ou l'autre forme. Il me faut mentionner une exception fort ancienne, c'est *Athenae* qui a donné l'adjectif *atheniensis* (au lieu d'*athenensis*) à laquelle il faut joindre une exception actuele, *madagascariensis ;* tout le monde utilisant ainsi ce vocable, il n'y a pas lieu de le transformer, suivant la règle, en *madagascarensis*.

Mais quelle règle suivre pour les noms géographiques modernes non latinisés ? Peut-on latiniser les noms géographiques actuels, en ajoutant, comme pour les noms de personne, la désinence du génitif latin *i*, *ae*, *arum ?* Les Règles de Nomenclature, sans l'avoir précisé, semblent le permettre, puisqu'elles donnent les exemples *antillarum et janmayeni.* On ne s'est pas fait faute de suivre ces deux exemples et de créer des termes comme *costaericae*, *cubae*, *panamae*, *mendozae*, *columbiae*, *portoricae*, *moraballii* (Moraballi, rivière de la Guyane), *missourrii*, *texasi*, *grandei* (Rio Grande, au Brésil), *transvaalis*, *pirini* (Pirin, en Bulgarie), *hebridisiarum*, etc. . . .

Bien qu'ayant une allure latine, ces termes incorrects ne me semblent pas admissibles. D'abord on n'en trouve pas nu seul de cette structure dans LINNÉ. Dans la 10° Edition du *Systema Naturae* je n'ai rien trouvé de semblable; ainsi les termes géographiques se rapportant à l'Amérique y sont : *americanus*, *mexicanus*, *surinamensis*, *pensylvanicus*, *jamaicensis*, *carolinus* et *carolinensis*, *canadensis*, *philadelphica*, *brasiliensis*, par conséquent formés à l'image des adjectifs latins classiques et réguliers *gallicus*, *tolosanus*, *burdigalensis*, *alpinus*.

D'autre part si des termes comme *antillarum*, *hebridisiarum*, *janmayeni*, *panamae*, *cubae*, *costaericae*, *columbiae*, *portoricae* (²) paraissent acceptables, on ne voit pas cependant sur quelle règle on se base pour former de pareils vocables.

Car, si, comme pour les noms de personnes, on admet l'addition de *i*, *ae*, *orum*, *arum* aux noms géographiques tels qu'ils s'écrivent dans leur pays, on obtient bien *janmayeni*, *moraballii*, *pirini*, *grandei*, mais alors il faudra dire : *antillasarum*, *panamaae*, *cubaae*, *costaricaae*, *portoricoi*, *mexicoi*, *perui*, etc. . .

Ou bien, si l'on admet que, pour les termes finissant par une consonne on ajoute *i*, *ae*, *orum*, *arum* et que ceux qui se terminent par une voyelle voient cette voyelle changée en *i*, *ae*, *orum*, *arum* (après avoir décidé de quel genre seront les noms géographiques), on obtient bien encore des termes comme *janmayeni*, *timori*, *madagascari*, *pirini*, *panamae*, *cubae*, mais il faudra dire *mexici* (ou *mexiqui*), *portorici*, *grandi*, *peri* (pour le Pérou), *urugayi*, etc. . . .

Dans l'un et l'autre cas ces termes, qui ont d'ailleurs allure de noms de personnes (ce qui peut prêter à confusion) et certains une consonnance désagréable, montrent qu'il n'est pas possible d'établir une règle commode de latinisation des noms géographiques modernes.

Cela est d'autant plus à rejeter qu'il est facile de former, avec tous les termes géographiques, des adjectifs commodes, euphoniques, à consonnance latine très nette, à l'image de ceux créés par LINNÉ et indiqués plus haut.

(²) De toutes façons *costaericae*, *portoricae* et *columbiae* sont mal formés, c'est au moins *costaricae*, *portorici* et *colombiae* qu'il aurait fallu écrire.

Il suffit d'ajatour au radical de ces noms l'un des suffixes *icus* (*a*, *um*), *inus* (*a*, *um*), *anus* (*a*, *um*), *ensis* (*e*), en choisissant ceux qui sont le plus agréables à l'orielle, comme :

guatemalicus, *guatemalinus*, *guatemalensis* ;
costaricinus, *costaricanus*, *costaricensis* ;
panamicus, *panamanus*, *panamensis* ;
portoricinus, *portoricanus*, *portoricensis* ;
madagascarinus, *madagascariensis* (¹) ;
mexicanus, *cubanus*, *cubensis* (³), etc.

J'insiste sur le fait qu'on doit toujours prendre le terme géographique, tel qu'il s'écrit dans le pays, et non sa traduction dans une autre langue, ce qui pourrait donner des termes assez différents comme *equateurensis* au lieu d'*ecuadorensis*, *bresilianus* au lieu de *brasilianus*.

A ce propos, j'indiquerai aussi que, lorsque le nom géographique actuel a un correspondant latin, c'est ce dernier qu'il faut *uniquement* utiliser ; je m'élève contre la possibilité que laissent les Règles de Nomenclature (recommandation de l'article 16) de laisser subsister un *bordeausiacus* (pour *burdigalensis*) èt un *viennensis* (pour *vindobonensis*). Je ne saurais mieux montrer l'absurdité de cette tolérance qu'en proposant des vocables comme *franceae*, *espagnicus* ou *toulousanus*. Si l'on n'admet pas—ce que je veux bien croire—*toulousanus*, *bordeausiacus*, n'est pas davantage admissible. D'ailleurs le maintien de semblables termes est en contradiction avec l'article 19 qui prévoit la correction d'un nom renfermant une faute de transcription, ce qui est le cas ici.

Quelques auteurs aussi ont récemment utilisé les noms géographiques avec le suffixe *cola :* *suedicola* (⁴), *canaricola*, *javacola*, *grandicola*, etc. . . . (qui habitent la Suède, les Canaries, Java, le Rio Grande). Cette façon de faire, qui parait cependant assez régulière, ne doit pas être employée, car les Latins ne l'ont jamais utilisée ; le terme *cola* semble avoir été réservé pour indiquer les lieux habités : *agricola*, *silvicola*, *rupicola*, *humicola*, *monticola*, *floricola*, *graminicola*, etc. . . . Les termes de *suedicola*, *canaricola*, etc. . . . sont donc à rejeter ; d'ailleurs les formes adjectives suffisent pour la formation des noms géographiques.

La question la plus embarrassante est celle des noms géographiques portant le nom d'un saint, saint Jean, saint Paul, saint Pierre, saint Mathieu,

---

(³) Il faut notamment rejeter *mexicicus* (*mexiquicus*) ou *mexicensis* (*mexiquensis*) qui sont peu euphoniques, ainsi que *cubicus* qui prête à confusion.

(⁴) Ce terme est d'ailleurs un affreux hybride, puisque Suède se dit *Suecia* en latin ; c'est donc *suecicola* qu'il aurait fallu dire.

saint Vincent, saint Denis, saint Domingue, saint Thomas, saint Barthélemy, sainte Catherine, sainte Hèlène, etc. . . ., ou un simple prénom (Maurice).

Ces termes ont des vocables différents suivant les langues :

Français	...	Saint Jean	Saint Vincent	Saint Mathieu	Sainte Catherine
Anglais	...	Saint John	Saint Vincent	Saint Matthew	Saint Catherine
Allemand	...	Sankt Johannes	Sankt Vincenz	Sankt Matthäus	Sankt Catharina
Italien	...	San Giovann	San Vincenzo	San Mattio	Santa Caterina
Espagnol	...	San Juan	San Vicente	San Mateo	Santa Catalina

Il n'est pas possible de se servir de ces termes pour former un nom géographique d'espèce, car chaque naturaliste risquerait d'utiliser le vocable que l'on emploie dans son pays ; d'où la nécessité d'avoir recours aux vocables latins correspondants : *Johannes* (*is*), *Paulus* (*i*), *Matthaeus*(*i*), *Vincentius* (*i*), *Dionysius* (*i*), *Dominicus* (*i*), *Thomus* (*ae*), *Bartholomaeus* (*i*), *Petrus* (*i*), *Catharina* (*ae*), *Helena* (*ae*), *Mauritius* (*i*).

A ce moment-là, rien n'est aussi simple que d'utiliser le génitif de ces mots, en faisant accorder l'adjectif *sanctus* (*sancti* ou *sanctae*, selon le cas) : *sanctaecatharinae, santaehelenae, sanctipauli*, suivant les exemples donnés par les Règles de nomenclature (articles 15 et 16), mais en les écrivant en un seul mot, sans trait d'union. Les autres noms cités formeront les vocables : *sanctijohannis, sanctimatthaei* (5), *sanctivincentii* (5), *sanctidionysii, sanctidominici, sanctithomae* (5), *sanctibartholomaei, sanctipetri, mauritii* (5).

Cependant pour certains termes il ne serait pas impossible d'admettre des adjectifs formés sur le terme original : San Mateo pourrait bien donner *sanmateensis*, San Juan *sanjuanensis*, San Salvador *sansalvadorinus*, San Thomas *santhomasinus*.

On pourra aussi dans certains cas apocoper la deuxième syllabe de *sancti* ou de *sanctae* pour former des adjectifs comme *sandionysicus* ou *sancathatinensis*.

Enfin *Mauritius* (l'île Maurice) peut aussi donner l'adjectif *mauritianus*.

De la même, façon, pour des termes composés avec " nouveau, nouvelle, neu, new, etc . . . . ", on formera l'adjectif avec le préfixe invariable *novo* (*novocaledonicus, novozelandicus, novosiberinus*), que l'on apocopera en *nov* quand le deuzième mot commence par une voyelle ou un h muet (*novenglandicus, novirlandinus, novorleanenis, novhebridianus*).

---

(5) Et non *sanmateoi, sanctivicenti, sanctithomasi, mauritia*, comme certains auteurs ont écrit.

CASE NO. 20

ARTICLE 20 : PROPOSED DELETION FROM, OF REFERENCE TO DIACRITIC MARKS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)744)

DOCUMENT 20/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

The problem presented by diacritic marks applicable, under Article 20, to scientific names based upon words which bear such marks was first brought to the attention of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in May 1951 by Dr. Helen Muir-Wood (*British Museum* (*Natural History*)) in connection with the generic names *Törnquistia* Reed, 1896 (a name given in honour of the Swedish palaeontologist Leonard Törnquist) and *Tornquistia* Paeckelmann, 1930 (a name given in honour of the German palaeontologist A. J. H. Tornquist). Dr. Muir-Wood did not question the value of the provision in Article 20 that diacritic marks are to be preserved in the formation of zoological names ; her sole purpose was to obtain a ruling whether names such as those cited above which differ from one another only by the presence, in the one case, and by the absence, in the other case, of a diacritic mark over one of the letters are to be treated as homonyms of one another. Dr. Muir-Wood's application was published in September 1951 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 92–94).

2. The publication of Dr. Muir-Wood's application elicited comments from the following sources :—

(i) Dr. C. J. Stubbefield (London) (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 114–115);

(ii) Dr. K. H. Key (*Canberra*) (1952, *ibid.* 6 : 250) (see also a longer paper published in the present volume in the series of papers relating to the problem of the emendation of names, where it bears the number Document 5/26)

(iii) Professor E. M. Hering (*Berlin*) (1952, *ibid.* 6 : 252–253)

(iv) Professor Leif Størmer (*Oslo*) (1952, *ibid.* 6 : 253—254)

(v) Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) (1952, *ibid.* 6 : 254)

(vi) Dr. Ernst Mayr (*American Museum of Natural History, New York*) (1952, *ibid.* **6** : 255)

(vii) Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America (see Document 20/2 annexed)

(viii) Professor Rudolf Richter (*Senckenberg, Frankfurt a.M.*) (This document being largely concerned with general emendation problems has been included under Case No. 5 (emendations) as Document 5/16)

(ix) Dr. Gerhard Regnéll (*Paläontologisches Institut der Universität Lund*) (see Document 20/3 annexed)

(x) Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A*) (see Document 20/4 annexed)

(xi) Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologisk Museum, Copenhagen*) (see Document 20/5 annexed)

3. Of the authors of the foregoing comments eight dealt only with the question submitted by Dr. Helen Muir-Wood (namely whether a condition of homonymy exists between two words which differ from one another in spelling only by the presence, in the one case, and the absence, in the other case, of a diacritic mark over or under one of the letters of the word of which the name consists or on which it is based) or with the closely allied question of the method to be adopted in transcribing diacritic marks. Three authors only dealt with the broader question of whether it is desirable to retain in Article 20 the existing provision recognising diacritic marks.

4. Of the eight authors referred to above, seven take the view that the presence of a diacritic mark makes an otherwise similar word which lacks a diacritic mark an entirely distinct word and may be taken as being in favour of the retention of the existing provision in Article 20. These authors are: (1) Dr. Stubblefield; (2) Professor Hering; (3) Professor Leif Størmer; (4) Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr.; (5) Dr. Ernst Mayr; (6) Professor Richter; (7) Dr. Regnéll. The Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America took the view (by a majority of eight to three) that names of the class referred to above should be treated as homonyms of one another, but it did not suggest any amendment of Article 20.

5. The remaining three of the specialists cited in paragraph 2 above, namely Dr. Key, Professor Chester Bradley and Dr. Henning Lemche, addressed themselves not to the limited issue raised by Dr. Muir-Wood but to the general question whether it was desirable to maintain the existing provision in Article 20 that diacritic marks are to be retained in scientific names when the words from which those names were derived had letters bearing such marks.

6. The whole assemblage of papers received on the subject of diacritic marks is relevant to the consideration of the question raised in a direct form by Professor Chester Bradley (Document 20/4) and it is for this reason that reference is made at this point to all these documents. An important proposal in a similar sense has been made by Professor Rudolf Richter in the paper included in the " Emendation " Series as Document 5/16. The only issue that arises at this stage is however the answer to be given to the proposal that the use of diacritic marks over letters comprised in scientific names should be abandoned, Article 20 being amended in this sense.

7. In the event of the rejection of the foregoing proposal, it will be necessary to consider the problem in relation to the Law of Homonymy raised by Dr. Muir-Wood and myself. For this purpose, this latter problem has been grouped with other problems relating to the Law of Homonymy where it appears as Case No. 51.

DOCUMENT 20/2

By the JOINT COMMITTEE ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE FOR PALEONTOLOGY IN AMERICA

Letter dated 18th February, 1952

(Comment on the request for a ruling that two names differing from another only by the presence, in one case, and the absence, in the other case, of a diacritic mark over or under one or more of the letters of which the word is composed should be treated as homonyms of one another.)

(Commission's Reference : Z.N.(S.)538)

The joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America has considered this subject, and I wish to inform you that, being polled, they voted :

To support the petition (8).
    J. Marvin Weller.*
    Bobb Schaeffer.
    Katherine V. W. Palmer.
    A. Myra Keen.
    Siemon W. Muller.
    John B. Reeside, Jr.
    R. C. Moore.
    Bryan Patterson.
To oppose the petition (3).
    Don L. Frizzell.
    John W. Wells.
    G. Winston Sinclair.

I have a note in press explaining my own reasons for opposing this petitionϕ.

---

* See also a separate note by this author reproduced as Document 5/13.

ϕ The copy of the paper here referred to that was asked for has not yet been received. (intl'd) F. H. 28th May, 1953.

DOCUMENT 20/3

By **GERHARD REGNÉLL**

(*Paläontologisches Institut der Universität Lund*)

Document received on 18th July, 1952

(**Editorial Note :** Prior to its submission to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, the present paper had been published in June, 1952, in the serial publication *Senckenbergiana* 33(1/3): 69–71).

Wiedergabe des skandinavischen ä durch das Klassische Latein-Alphabet

Das Feld der zoologischen (und gewiss auch der botanischen) Nomenklatur ist voll tieferer oder flacherer Fallgruben, in die der sorglose Wanderer leicht geraten kann. Durch die Bestrebungen verschiedener Kräfte ist freilich manches geleistet worden, um den schmalen Weg, auf dem allein man wohlbehalten das Ziel erreicht, so gut wie möglich abzustecken. Freilich kann man sowohl über Weg als auch Ziel unbegrenzt und unfruchtbar streiten, aber allmählich muss doch eine Stabilisierung eintreten. Damit dieser Zustand nicht in allzuweiter Ferne winke, ist es wichtig, auch scheinbar bedeutungslose Einzelheiten zu berücksichtigen. Eine solche betrifft die Wiedergabe von Lettern, die gewissen Sprachen eigen und daher nicht international gängig und in manchen Druckereien nicht vorhanden sind. Dieser Fall ist kürzlich von RUD. RICHTER (1952) erörtert worden.

Lettern dieser Art sind in den skandinavischen Sprachen *å*, *ä* (im Dänischen und Norwegischen *æ*) und *ö* (im Dänischen und besonders im Norwegischen als ø geschrieben). Die beiden letztgenannten (*ä*, *ö*) finden sich auch im Deutschen. Sie können—und sollten—durch die *fakultativen Varianten ae* beziehungsweise *oe* ersetzt werden. Die Frage, wie man in dieser Hinsicht mit dem *å* zu verfahren hat, lässt RICHTER (1952 : 361) offen : " Es muss den Schweden überlassen bleiben, wie sie das *å* durch das Klassische Latein-Alphabet wiedergegeben zu sehen wünschen, wenn eine Druckerei die ' diakritsche ' Letter nicht besitzt ". Einer brieflichen Aufforderung Prof. RICHTER's entgegenkommend, will ich in den folgenden Zeilen diese Frage in aller Kürze besprechen und versuchen, eine Antwort darauf zu geben.

In den allermeisten Fällen handelt es sich um Autor-Namen, in denen ein *å* vorkommt, oder—was für die Nomenklatur von viel grösserer Bedeutung ist—um Paten-Namen, wo sich im Namen des Paten ein *å* findet. Dagegen dürften geographische Namen, die ein *å* enthalten, in der Regel nicht für nomenklatorische Zwecke in Anspruch genommen worden sein.

Zuerst ein Beispiel. Einer der hervorragendsten Schüler Carl v. Linné's war Petter Forskål. Durch seine Reisen in Arabien machte er sich um die Naturwissenschaften hoch verdient. Ihm zu Ehren sind folgende zoologische Gattungs-Namen geschaffen worden (sämtlich Neave 1939 entnommen) :

Forskalia Koelliker 1953 (Coelent.),
Forskälia Adams 1854 (Moll.),
Forskaliopsis Haeckel 1888 (Coelent.),
Forskalena Iredale 1918 (Moll.),
Forskaliopsis Coen 1931 (Moll.) (Hononym).

Uberdies bestehen folgende Synonyme von *Forskälia:*
Forskåhlia Smith 1879,
Forscalia Paetel 1888 (nach Artikel 34 und 35 der IRZN Homonym von *Forskalia* Koelliker).

Ferner ist auch eine Pflanzen-Gattung nach Forsskål benannt, nämlich :
Forskaolea Linné (Urtic.).

Abgesehen von anderen orthographischen Eigentümlichkeiten bemerken wir, dass das *å* auf vier verschiedene Weisen wiedergegeben ist : als *å*, und transkribiert als *a*, *ä* und *ao*. Welcher von dieser Schreibarten soll man aus orthographischen Gründen den Vorzug geben (der nomenklatorische Status der verschiedenen Namensformen ist hier ganz ausser Acht gelassen) ?

1. Von *ä*, als fakultativer Variante zu *ae*, kann offenbar keine Rede sein (eine Folge des Vikariierens von *ä* und *ae* ist übrigens, dass der Name *Forskälia*, der neben *Forskalia* nomenklatorisch gültig ist, auch—und empfehlungsweise —als *Forskaelia* gescrieben werden kann, wodurch die Attribuierung zu Forskål völlig verwischt wird).

2. *ao* erscheint befremdend, obwohl in den Weltsprachen der Lautwert dieses Diphtongs an den des *ä* einigermassen erinnern dürfte, und das *å* wohl dadurch entstanden ist, dass ein *o* über ein *a* geschrieben wurde.

3. Am häufigsten wird *å* durch *a* wiedergegeben. Weitere Beispiele (Neave 1940, 1950) : *Stalia* Reuter 1872 (Hemipt.) dem Entomologen Carl Stål gewidmet (vgl. Richter 1948 : 130 ; 1952 : 364) ; *Westergardia* Raymond 1924 (Trilob.) dem Geologen und Paläontologen A. H. Westergård gewidmet ; *Tragardhacarus* Zachvatkin 1945 (Arachn.) dem Entomologen Ivar Trägårdh gewidmet (in dem Namen *Tragardhacarus* sind also *ä* und *å* als gleichwertig behandelt). Zugunsten dieser Schreibart könnte vorgebracht werden, dass im Latienischen das schwedische *å* als *a* transkribiert wird : Scania steht für Skåne, Acho (oder Achatius) für Åke (Eigenname). Doch ist es nicht

befriedigend, dass die Laute *a* und *å* beide mit der Letter *a* bezeichnet werden. Dazu kommt, dass dasselbe Zeichen oft auch für *ä* gelten muss (*Tragardhacarus*!)

Welche Möglichkeit bleibt uns dann übrig, nachdem wir alle drei obige Alternativen abgelehnt haben ?

Phonologisch hat das *å* mehrere Wurzeln, ist aber in erster Reihe aus langem *a*-Laut hervorgegangen. Dass dies der Fall ist, ist im Dänischen wie im Norwegischen besonders ersichtlich, wo das lange *å* durch *aa* bezeichnet wird. Doch is die Letter *å* nunmehr im Dänischen und Norwegischen eingebürgert. Um eine Verwechslung mit einerseits *a* und andererseits *ä* zu vermeiden, scheint es mir angebracht, *aa als fakultative Variante zu å anzuerkennen.* Dass z. B. im Deutschen *aa* einen anderen Lautwert hat, dürfte in diesem Zusammenhang keine Ungelegenheiten verursachen.

Zusammenfassend ergibt sich, dass der von RICHTER (1952 : 362) vorgeschlagene Zusatz zu Artikel 20 der IRZN in folgender Wiese zu ergänzen wäre :

> " Alle Namen, die mit *å*, *ä*, *ö* und *ü* veröffentlicht worden sind, dürfen auch mit *aa*, *ae*, *oe* und *ue* übernommen werden. Beide Schreibweisen sind fakultative, also nomenklatorisch unwirksame Varianten. Dagegen ist der Unterschied zwischen *a* und *å* (=*aa*), *a* und *ä* (=*ae*), *o* und *ö* (=*oe*), *u* und *ü* (=*ue*) nomenklatorisch wirksam und verhindert die Homonymie sonst gleicher Namen."

Schriften.

NEAVE, S. A., 1939 : Nomenclator zoologicus. **2.** — London.
— — —, 1940 : Nomenclator zoologicus. **4.** — London.
— — —, 1950 : Nomenclator zoologicus. **5.** — London.
RICHTER, RUD., 1948. Einführung in die Zoologische Nomenklatur durch Erläuterung der Internationalen Regeln. 2., umgearbeitete Auflage. — Frankfurt a. M.
— — —, 1952 : Schulz der Tier-Namen vor Emendation. (Veränderung der Schreibweise infolge von Diakritischen Zeichen, Umlaut und Transskription). — Senckenbergiana. **32** : 357-366. Frankfurt a. M.

Zusatz der Schriftleitung

Es scheint sich nur um die Schreibweise eines Lautes zu handeln. Aber die bisherige Unklarheit darüber hat die Stabilität der Tier-Namen gefährdet und unnötige Veröffentlichungen veranlasst. Die dankenswerten Ausführungen des verdienten *schwedischen* Forschers werden endgültig Klarheit gebracht haben. Wir dürfen das um so mehr hoffen, als uns anabhängig inzwischen Kollege GUNNAR HEMMINGSMOEN von der Universität Oslo dieselbe Stellungnahme auch vom Standpunkt der *norwegischen* und der *dänischen* Sprache mitgeteilt hat.

DOCUMENT 20/4

By **J. CHESTER BRADLEY** (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A*)

Statement received on 11th August, 1952

DIACRITIC MARKS

Article 20 of the *Règles* requires that in transcribing a barbarous word diacritic marks should be retained.

Diacritic marks form no part of the Latin language. A word written with a diacritic mark is neither Latin nor Latinised as Latin is traditionally written. Therefore this requirement is a direct contradiction of the basic requirement that the scientific names of animals must be words that are either Latin or Latinised. Is it desirable to make this exception to the basic rule ?

In several languages, as for example Spanish, and the Scandinavian tongues, letters distinguished by certain diacritic marks are looked upon as representing additional letters of the alphabet unknown to the Latin language. They are no more Latin than is the Greek letter theta, which in transliteration to Latin would be written th.

The Standard Dictionary defines a diacritic mark as " A sign attached to a letter to indicate its exact phonetic use or value or to distinguish it from some other letter ". Note that the phonetic significance of a particular sign may vary widely according to the language in which it appears, and that different signs may be employed in different languages (rarely even in the same language, as o or ö in Norwegian) to indicate the same phonetic value. In transliteration to another language, if retained, they lose all phonetic significance. Thus the phonetic value of diacritic marks on a word taken from a barbarous language loses all phonetic significance when placed over a Latin letter. It could only be used at all by a reader who knew the origin of the word and how that phonetic sign was used in that particular language. In even such an attempt to use it, the user would be de-Latinizing his pronunciation.

Certainly the rule including diacritic marks as part of the Latinised spelling of a barbarous word in Zoological Nomenclature contemplates employing only those marks that have become requisite to the proper spelling of the word in its original language.

All diacritic marks have a historical origin, and must be considered separately for each language. Many of these marks are the result of umlaut. Indeed the mark itself is referred to in German as an umlaut.

An umlaut is defined as the euphonic modification of a root vowel sound by the influence of a, u, or especially i, in the syllable which formerly followed. It is peculiar to Teutonic languages. In German umlauted vowels resulting from a, o, u followed by old i are written in either of two ways, namely ä, ö, ü, or ae, oe, ue.

Here it would be simple to require that such instances be transliterated into Latin by using the latter spelling (cf. Recommendation in Article 20).

Swedish, Danish and Norse each have three letters added to their alphabet which are for the most part indicated by diacritic marks, differing somewhat in the three. The writer is not a Scandinavian scholar, but these appear to be also the result of umlaut. They are :—

1.	Swedish :	Å	awe,	pronounced as au in saw
	Danish :	Å or Aa	au,	,, ,, ,, ,, ,,
	Norwegian :	Aa or Å	awe,	,, ,, ,, ,, ,,
			in Norwegian this is identical with open " o ".	
2.	Swedish :	Ä	ey,	pronounced as a in sale
	Danish :	AE	Eh,	,, ,, ,, ,, ,,
	Norwegian :	AE	a,	,, ,, ,, ,, am
3.	Swedish :	Ö	eu,	pronounced as Eu in French peu
	Danish :	ö or ø	Eu,	,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,,
	Norwegian :	ø or ö	u,	,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,,

It would thus seem (but this should be confirmed by a competent authority) that character number 1 might be transliterated into Latin as " aa " ; character number 2 as " ae ", and character 3 (clearly equivalent to German ö or oe) as " oe ".

Turning to Spanish we note the letter enya written as ñ, n with a tilde. It forms the 17th letter of the Spanish alphabet and is a transformation from the ancient Spanish " nn ". I leave it to a Spanish linguist to decide whether it would be better transliterated into Latin as " nn " or by " ny " which seems to approach its phonetic value more succintly.

The sedilla is used in certain instances in Spanish under c to indicate a soft pronunciation. In transliteration into Latin, perhaps it could be merely omitted, or there may be a better solution.

The use of the accent marks in Spanish may be either to denote a stressed syllable, or to distinguish one word or its use from another. It is doubtful that the framers of the *Règles* contemplated the retention of these, but if not, they should be excluded.

I have but the slightest familiarity with Portuguese and will merely point out that the diacritic marks occur in the following connections :—

Éi, Ói, Éu, ǎo, ǎe, and ǒe.

In French acute accent, occurring only over E, the grave accent over e, a or u, or the circumflex may occur over any vowel do not indicate stress. They have a historical background which must be considered in any decision concerning method of transliterating the letters that bear them into Latin, but this will not be discussed here.

In Hungarian the following diacritic marks are in obligatory use, each indicating a phonetic value of the vowel over which it stands :—

á	like	a in father
é	,,	a in face
ö	,,	ea in earth (short)
ő	,,	eu in French peu (long)
ü	,,	French u (short)
ű	,,	German fühlen (long).

Enough has been said to show the inadequacy of the statement " including diacritic marks " in Article 20, and to show that to include them is illogical.

If they are to be regarded at all, then a preliminary study must be undertaken in consultation with linguistic authorities, and an additional schedule appended to the *Règles* showing just how each diacritic mark (the use of which in the particular language is obligatory) is to be handled in transliterating each language in which it occurs into Latin.

Whether words already introduced into zoological nomenclature with diacritic marks (therefore not Latin in form and bearing marks that are meaningless from the viewpoint of the Latin language or as Latinised words) are to be corrected according to schedules of transliteration set up, to remain undisturbed, or to be spelled as they are with the diacritic marks omitted is a matter for discussion. That having been decided, the question of how these words enter into homonymy must be opened.

Since there are no diacritic marks in the Latin language, the conclusion is inescapable that a word written with a diacritic mark is a homonym of the same word written without it. It is debatable as to whether a barbarous word taken over into Latin as spelled in the original language, except with the diacritic mark omitted, or so spelled but with the mark is to be regarded as the homonym of the same word transliterated according to a certain schedule (ex. gr. mulleri, müller or muelleri). The logical answer seems to be " yes " but perhaps it is not a practical answer.

In any event the schedule suggested should be prepared as a guide for the future, whether obligatory or with the force of a Recommendation.

Believing myself that any author in coining a name from a barbarous word should be allowed the privilege of spelling it as he chooses, as long as he uses Latin letters, quite as though he were employing any arbitrary combination of letters, I should favour making a Recommendation for the future only.

From these considerations I propose that at Copenhagen in 1953 Article 20 be amended by striking out the words " including diacritic marks " and substituting for them " excluding diacritic marks ", and further by adding words to the effect that the spelling of such a barbarous word bearing a diacritic mark may be interpreted to be that indicated by the historic significance of that particular mark in the language concerned particularly as shown in any schedule that may be prepared and appended to the *Règles* for the purpose.

DOCUMENT 20/5

By **HENNING LEMCHE** (*Universitetets Zoologiska Museum, Copenhagen*)

Letter dated 6th September, 1952

Editorial Note : The following letter was written with special reference to a note by myself on a minor ambiguity in the meaning of the provision in Article 20 relating to diacritic marks, but it is included in the present series and not under Case No. 52 because in it Dr. Lemche raised the general question whether the use of diacritic marks should continue to be obligatory. (intl'd) F. H., 15th June, 1953.

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)540)

The case Z.N.(S.)655 (*Munsteroceras*) is one of the many examples of the difficulties involved in any use of diacritic marks. It appears as if we are to decide either to discard any use whatsoever of diacritic marks and adhere strictly to the old Latin alphabet—or to use every such sign that may turn up in any language now or later written in Latin-like letters.

This last procedure is that accepted today, but the difficulties involved appear endless, and it may be better to postpone voting on Z.N.(S.)538 and 655 until after the general treatment of the problem. I would like to propose a thorough investigation into the consequences of the practical application for both alternatives.

Personally, I am convinced that the printing difficulties will always prevent any uniformity in the use of diacritic marks. Consequently, I am in favour of finding the best way to get rid of all of them—even including those in my own language. The old Latin alphabet contained no diacritic marks. These have been taken over from other languages, i.e. so to say from other alphabets. But no one has ever proposed to write—say—generic names based on Russian in the Cyrillic alphabet, but what is the difference between such letters and letters with diacritic marks introduced to indicate new sounds. People have simply used the Latin alphabet as a basic stock to which they have added freely extra marks to indicate totally new meanings of the letters chosen. I fail to see the necessity of accepting these marks when we discard cyrillic letters. The only thing we need is some advice how to transcribe.

CASE No. 21

ARTICLE 20 : PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONCLUDING PORTION OF " RECOMMANDATION "

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)392)

DOCUMENT 21/1

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse, France*)

Editorial Note : The following application was submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in 1948 but at the Paris Session was deferred for later consideration (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 209–212). The present application was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 198), but, as it is quite short, it is here reprinted for convenience of reference. In connection with this proposal, reference should be made also to a paper by J. Gerhard Regnéll, which has been included in the main series of papers relating to diacritic marks as Document 20/3. (intl'd) F. H., 20th May, 1953.

. . . .

PROPOSITION 16

Modification au dernier paragraphe de la Recommendation de l'artiêle 20.

Article 20. Recommandation : Dernier paragraphe. *Pour les noms patronymiques comprenant des lettres ä, ö, ü, que l'on peut écrire aussi ae, oe, ue, il est recommandé, si l'on utilise ces noms pour former des noms de genre ou d'espece, d'adopter l'ecriture ä, ö, ü, Exemples:*

bäbleri (*non baebleri*)	*Dönitzia* (non *Doenitzia*)
Mülleria (*non Muelleria*)	*brünnichi* (non *bruennichi*)

Explication: Il semble que l'usage le plus courant soit d'employer ces lettres avec le tréma. De plus si la prononciation *ä*, *ae* d'une part, *ö*, *oe* d'autre part, sont indentiques, il n'en est pas de même de *ü* (que l'on doit prononcer comme un *u* français) et de *ue* que l'on risque de prononcer *ue*, ce qui modifie la prononciation réelle du nom.

Enfin l'écriture avec *ae, oe, ue* deplace serieusement la position des termes ainsi orthographies, dans des listes alphabétiques : si l'on ne prend pas soin de regarder ces listes aux deux graphies possibles, on risque parfois de croire qu'un nom est oublie, alors qu'il est inscrit à un autre endroit.

DOCUMENT 21/2

By the late **LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO** (*University of Parma, Italy*)

Statement received on 19th January, 1948

PROPOSAL No. 16 OF PROF. BONNET, SUGGESTING A MODIFICATION TO THE LAST PARAGRAPH OF THE RECOMMENDATION OF ARTICLE 20

I fully agree for reasons of uniformity.

CASE No. 22

ARTICLE 20 : PROPOSED ADDITION OF A " RECOMMANDATION " DEPRECATING THE USE OF DIPHTHONGS IN THE PRINTING OF SCIENTIFIC NAMES

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)258)

DOCUMENT 22/1

Letter dated 24th January, 1945, from **E. B. FORD**, M.A., D.Sc.
(*Oxford University, Department of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy, Oxford*)

Following our conversation of yesterday, I am writing, officially as it were, to ask if there is any pronouncement or *Opinion* to the effect that the use of diphthongs is undesirable in the printing of generic and specific names. I think it very desirable that the use of diphthongs should be discouraged.

DOCUMENT 22/2

Extract from a letter dated 22nd January, 1945, from **FRANCIS HEMMING,** Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, to Dr. E. B. Ford

The use of diphthongs in the printing of the scientific names of animals is, in my view, objectionable because such use leads very easily to misprints and even more easily to errors of transcription by later authors when copying a name from a book in which diphthongs have been used for this purpose.

There is, however, at present no express provision in regard to the question of diphthongs in the *Règles Internationales,* and the question has not been the subject of an *Opinion* by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

DOCUMENT 22/3

Letter dated 23rd April, 1951, from Dr. **ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY**
(*University of California, Department of Zoology, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*)

I am in hearty agreement with the proposal that a *Recommandation* be added to the appropriate *Règles* to the effect that linked diphthongs æ and œ be not used in zoological names and that, where they have been used in generic and trivial names as originally proposed, they be replaced with separately printed letters " a + e " and " o + e ". This probably requires some rewording of Article 20 which states that " the exact original spelling [of names], including diacritic marks, is to be retained ".

CASE No. 23

ARTICLE 21 : PROPOSED CLARIFICATION OF A DECISION TAKEN IN 1948 REGARDING THE CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH A NEW NAME IS TO BE ATTRIBUTED TO AN AUTHOR OTHER THAN THAT BY WHOM THE BOOK OR PAPER IN WHICH THE NEW NAME WAS PUBLISHED IS WRITTEN

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)733)

DOCUMENT 23/1

By **ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY**
(*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*)

Letter dated 5th January, 1951

ARTICLE 21 : PROBLEMS IN CITATION OF AUTHORSHIP

At Paris there was considered the problem of citing authorship for names to be credited to other(s) than the author(s) of a paper or book in which said name first appeared (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 564–566). There was also considered the crediting of names published first as *nomina nuda* or given currency as MS. names (259–260). In my opinion a certain amount of conflict can arise in the manner in which these two rulings are applied.

Let us suppose that White publishes a new species L—— m—— and credits it to Black. I suppose that if he expressly states that Black has used L—— m—— as a MS. name, then the name L—— m—— is to be credited to White alone ; but, if he does not so state, then the name must be rendered L—— m—— Black *in* White, ——. But, suppose in the first case, in addition to stating that in Black's usage L—— m—— was a MS. name, White also indicates that Black was responsible for the description of the species. Which ruling then takes precedence ?

I think some sort of clarification of this point is desirable to cover, if possible, cases that may be equivocal under the present wording of decisions taken at Paris on the matter of crediting and citing authorship.

DOCUMENT 23/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

In his letter of 5th January, 1951 (reproduced as Document 23/1) Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty has raised the question whether the decisions taken in Paris in 1948 in regard to the authorship to be attributed (1) to a name which, prior to being published in conditions which satisfy the requirements of Article 25, had acquired an irregular currency either through its having been used as a manuscript name or through its having been published as a *nomen nudum* (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 259–260) and (2) to a name published in a paper by author " A " with a clear statement that the description provided for the name in question was provided by author " B " (1950, *ibid.* **4** : 564–566).

2. For convenience of reference the two decisions referred to above are reproduced in the annexe to the present note.

3. On comparing these decisions it does appear that some clarification is required.

(1) to make it clear that the special rule set out on pp. 565–566 takes precedence over the rule set out on pp. 259–260 ;

(2) to make it clear that the special rule set out on pp. 565–566 applies only where the book or paper concerned contains a clear indication not only that the name in question was proposed by some author other than that by whom the book or paepr concerned was written but also that the indication, definition or description on which, under Article 25, the availability of that name depends was written not by the author of the book or paper concerned but by the author to whom the name is there attributed.

4. In addition, it may be noted that, while the decision in point (b) on page 566 covers—as it was intended that it should—the case where an author " A " publishes a name with a clear statement that the description provided for it was written by another author " C ", irrespective of whether, at the time of the publication of the name, author " C " was responsible for that name being published by author " A " or whether at that time author " C " was dead and author " A " merely published a manuscript description written by the deceased author " C ", the wording used in the introductory portion of the foregoing decision (on page 565) is consistent only with the first of the foregoing situations (owing to the use of the phrase " published by one author in a book or paper written by another author ".

5. Finally, it will, I think, be well to review the wording of the decision recorded on pages 259–260 of vol. 4 of the *Bulletin* after the conclusion of the discussion which is to take place under Case No. 33 in regard to the status of names published in synonymies, in order to make sure that the two decisions are in line with one another in all respects.

Annexe 1 to Document 23/2

Text of the decision taken in 1948 in regard to the authorship of " nomina nuda " and manuscript names when first validly published with an " indication "

Extract from pp. 259–260 of vol. 4 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

> that words should be inserted either in Article 25 or some other part of the *Règles* to make it clear that, when a name is validly published in conditions which satisfy the provisos to Article 25 and the name in question accordingly acquires rights under the Law of Priority and, prior to being so published, that name had either been published as a *nomen nudum* or had been a manuscript name, the name is to be attributed to the author by whom it was first published in conditions which satisfied the requirements of the said provisos to Article 25 and not to the earlier author by whom it had either been published as a *nomen nudum* or had been given currency as a manuscript name.

Annexe 2 to Document 23/2

Text of a decision taken in 1948 regarding the authorship to be attributed to a name for which the indication, definition or description was written by one author in cases where that name and indication, definition or description was first published in a book or paper by another author

Extract from pp. 565–566 of vol. 4 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that the following provisions should be added to Article 21 prescribing the method to be followed (i) in determining the authorship to be attributed to a name published in a book or paper written jointly by two or more authors and to a name published by one author in a book or paper written by another author, and (ii) in citing names so published :—

(a) Where in a book or paper written jointly by two or more authors, it is clearly stated that one of those authors is exclusively responsible for the description of one or more specified taxonomic units there named, the name or names so published are to be attributed solely to the author stated to be responsible for the descriptions thereof and not jointly to both or all of the joint authors of the book or paper. The name of a taxonomic unit so described and named by an author " B " in a paper written jointly by himself and one or more other authors (say, a paper written jointly by authors " A " and " B ") is to be cited as having been published by " ' B ' in ' A ' and ' B ' ".

(b) Where in a book or paper written by one author (say author " A ") it is clearly stated that the description of one or more specified taxonomic units there named has been prepared exclusively by some other author (say, author " C "), the name or names in question are to be attributed to author " C ", not to author " A ". The name of a taxonomic unit so described and named is to be cited by later authors as having been published by " ' C ' in ' A ' ".

CASE No. 24

ARTICLE 22: PROPOSED DRAFTING AMENDMENT OF, IN THE INTERESTS OF CONSISTENCY

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)745)

DOCUMENT 25/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

The purpose of the present note is to suggest a small drafting amendment in Article 22 in order to remove an inconsistency between that Article and Article 23.

2. At the time when the present *Règles* were adopted, authors commonly placed the dates of specific names in round brackets (parentheses). The *Règles*, as then adopted, did not deal expressly with the question of the citation of the dates of scientific names, but a provision was inserted—Article 23—designed to make it possible at a glance to see whether a given specific name, as cited by a subsequent author, consisted of the same binominal combination as that which had been used when the species concerned was originally named. Under this provision the use of round brackets (parentheses) was reserved for distinguishing, either (a) the name of the author of a specific name, or (b) the name of that author, together with the date of publication of that name, in cases where the species in question was cited as belonging to some genus other than that in which it was originally described.

3. In the ensuing decades the need became increasingly felt for some convenient means by which to indicate whether the date assigned to a given specific name was the date clearly and correctly stated in the publication in which the name first appeared ; for this purpose the practice grew up of placing round brackets (i.e., of fitting in parentheses) or of placing square brackets around dates assigned to specific names in cases where the date in question was determined otherwise than directly from the original publication. The utility of this practice was recognised in Paris in 1948 when rules were introduced for its regulation (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 225—226).

4. In the case of the names of taxonomic units, other than species, the *Règles*, as adopted in 1901, provided, in Article 22, that, where it was decided to cite the date of such a name, this might be done, either (i) by adding the date immediately after the name of the author, a comma being inserted between the author's name and the date, or (ii) by citing the date in round brackets (parentheses) immediately after the name of the author, no comma being inserted after the author's name if this method of citation was adopted. In the period which has since elapsed the first of these methods of citation has become generally accepted, being the method used, for example, in such standard reference works as Sherborn's *Index Animalium* and Neave's *Nomenclator Zoologicus*. For this reason alone there would be good grounds for reasons of consistency for removing from Article 23 the second of the two alternative provisions. But, as it seems to me, the need for providing a means for indicating cases where the date assigned to a given generic name has been derived from some source other than the date given in the publication in which the name first appeared provides an overpowering reason in favour of the foregoing course. For, so long as it is permissible to place in round brackets (parentheses) the date of a generic name which is derived directly from the original work (*e.g.*, so long as it is permissible to cite in round brackets (parentheses) the date " 1758 " for a generic name or for a name of higher rank published in the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae*), it will be impossible to apply to such names the system of notation adopted for specific names (see paragraph 3 above) for the purpose of distinguishing from one another (i) a date derived direct from the original publication (*e.g.*, the date 1758 for the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae*) and (ii) a date derived from some source other than the book in which the name in question was first published.

5. For the foregoing reasons, I suggest for consideration (1) that the words " or by parentheses " should be deleted from the end of Article 22, and (2) that the second example given in that Article, namely " *Primates* Linné (1758) " should also be deleted, the word " Examples " being changed at the same time to the singular number (Example).

CASE No. 25

ARTICLE 23 : AUTHORSHIP OF A COMBINATION

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)512)

DOCUMENT 25/1

By **ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY**

(*University of California, Department of Zoology, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*)

Letter dated 5th February, 1951

AUTHORSHIP OF A COMBINATION

Article 23 was only touched upon at Paris. The last sentence thereof was not considered at all ; it is : " If it is desired to cite the author of a new combination, his name follows the parentheses . . . " The term " combination " is not defined or clarified. I have encountered two situations in which the authorship of a combination is in doubt and which do not seem to be covered by the present wording.

The first is the more general question as to whether, when a species is referred to another genus without the new combination of generic and trivial names being actually used, the author so doing is to be credited with the new combination, or the first author thereafter who actually makes the combination. In my own work I have made the latter assumption and an example is to be found in my paper on *Opinion* 99. In the case in question, Casagrandi & Barbagallo, in 1895, erected the new genus *Entamoeba* and referred to it the species *Amoeba coli* without making the combination *Entamoeba coli*, which was actually first done by Schaudinn in 1903. Therefore, under Article 23 should the complete designation of this species be *Entamoeba coli* (Grassi, 1879) C. & B., 1895, or *E. coli* (Grassi, 1879) Schaudinn, 1903 ? Some competent zoologists of my acquaintance would subscribe to the former usage. I personally feel that only a ruling of the Commision can decide the point.

The second point is in some ways comparable to the problem involved under Article 30 when a genus is established with a misidentified species as type. It is the case of a new combination based on a species misidentified as an earlier species. I have in mind the case where species, *Pelodera pellio*, was described by Schneider in 1866. Later, Bütschli, in 1873, described specimens, referring them to Schneider's species, which he transferred to the genus *Rhabditis*. However, Bütschli actually was not dealing with Schneider's species, but rather with a species now correctly known as *Rhabditis maupasi* Seurat, 1919. *Rhabditis pellio* is the currently used specific name for Schneider's species. Is Bütschli to be credited with the combination—or the first person to apply " *R. pellio* " to Schneider's original species ? I have, myself, taken the former stand on the supposition that nomenclatorial union of generic and trivial name is independent of the taxonomic application of the name. But there is room for argument, and Article 23 does not provide an answer.

Also, what about the case of a combination first used by a given author but credited by him to another ? How should it be cited ?

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

Triple-Part 3/5 (Emendation of names)

Technical reproduction difficulties are still delaying the publication of Triple-Part 3/5 (dealing with the problem of the emendation of zoological names). It is hoped, however, that this Part will be published in the very near future.

Printed in England by Metcalfe & Cooper Limited, 10-24 Scrutton St., London E C 2

VOLUME 10. Part 9
Pp. 263—298

23rd July, 1953

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Copenhagen Discussions, Cases Nos. 27 to 32 : Six cases dealing with various aspects of Article 25 of the " Règles "

LONDON:
Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1953

Price Fifteen Shillings

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (6th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The Officers and Staff of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Part 9 (pp. 263—298) 23rd July, 1953

EDITORIAL NOTE

The present Part contains the documents prepared for consideration at Copenhagen in relation to seven cases. These are those to which the Case Numbers 26 to 32 have been allotted.

2. Of these applications the first (Case No. 26) is concerned with a suggested addition to Article 23, in order to provide a means for the uniform citation of names in cases where a particular species is doubtfully referred to a given genus or where one species is doubtfully identified with another.

3. The remaining six cases are all concerned with one aspect or another of Article 25. The subjects so dealt with are the following :—

Case No. 27. Proposed insertion of a provision that the distribution of a microfilm does not constitute " publication " of the paper reproduced in this manner and therefore that nothing contained in it possesses any status in zoological nomenclature (Z.N.(S.)528)

Case No. 28. Proposed co-ordination with other parts of the *Règles* of the provision in Article 25 relating to the nomenclatorial status of books and papers, the manner of the issue of which does not satisfy the tests prescribed for " publication " (Z.N.(S.)741)

Case No. 29. Proposed redrafting of Provisos (a) and (c) to Article 25 to make it clear that, in order for a name to become available, it must be published with diagnostic characters (Z.N.(S.)738)

Case No. 30. Proposed insertion in Provisos (a) and (c) to Article 25 of a provision denying availability in the case of the trivial name of any fossil species unless at the time of the publication of that name there was published also a figure of the species in question (Z.N.(S.)693).

Case No. 31. Question whether a name given to a nominal genus, the type specimen of the type species of which is a pathological monstrosity should be given any status of availability (Z.N.(S.)719)

Case No. 32. Proposed insertion of a provision that a name published by an author who made it clear that his object in so doing was some purpose other than that of providing a name for use in zoological nomenclature possesses no status of availability (Z.N.(S.)668).

CASE No. 26

ARTICLE 23 : PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF A METHOD OF CITATION IN CASES WHERE A SPECIES IS DOUBTFULLY REFERRED TO A GIVEN GENUS AND WHERE ONE SPECIES IS DOUBTFULLY IDENTIFIED WITH ANOTHER

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)152)

DOCUMENT 26/1

By **LLOYD G. HENBEST**

(*United States Geological Survey, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

Letter dated 20th March, 1944

I wish to place the following problem in taxonomic nomenclature before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

A problem arises from confused usage in qualifying taxonomic names with the question mark. This is not a new problem, but evidence indicates that previous efforts at standardising usage have not succeeded. I have discussed this subject with fourteen taxonomists, who represent as many fields of taxonomy. I have encountered five different opinions on the question. Variation in usage appears in paleontologic literature. Dr. R. W. Brown, a paleobotanist of the U.S. Geological Survey, has recently shown me instances of confusion in paleobotanical literature. If my experience is representative, confusion will prevail until a generally satisfactory style is recommended for taxonomists to follow.

The greatest difference of opinion was expressed on the proper way of questioning the specific name. Fair agreement exists on the other uses of the question mark.

I shall list six examples of variation in the position and use of the question mark and discuss each one separately. The specific name is fictitious.

(1) ? *Fusulina nanicella* Smith 1885

(2) *Fusulina* ? *nanicella* Smith 1885

(3) *Fusulina nanicella* ? Smith 1885

(4) (a) *Fusulina nanicella* Smith ? 1885 (question mark here intended to qualify the species)

(b) *Fusulina nanicella* Smith Smith ? 1885 (same position as in example 4 (a) but intended to qualify name of author)

(5) *Fusulina nanicella* Smith 1885 ?

Example 1.—The question mark in front of any isolated series of connected words is generally regarded as qualifying the entire series. The same is understood when the question mark is placed in front of a taxonomic name, if the name is isolated, as in synonymies, faunal lists, and headings. The reference here is rather self-evident, and everyone seems to agree on the meaning of this style of usage.

If, however, a name that is preceded by a question mark stands in a series of words, as in a sentence, the question mark might reasonably be misconstrued as qualifying a preceding word. At least three measures could be taken to prevent such an ambiguity or dangling reference. One possible method consists of placing the question mark and the entire name and author citation in parentheses, as for example (? *Dictyonema parva* Doe, 1930). A second method consists of writing the question mark in front of the generic name but without a space between them, as for example, ?*Dictyonema parva* Doe, 1930. A third method consists of enclosing the entire name in parentheses and placing the question mark after the last parenthesis. Though this third method would involve an undesirable change of style from that commonly used in synonymies, the meaning would be clear. Perhaps the occasion to qualify an entire name in a sentence is so rare that it is unnecessary to recommend a style or perhaps it would be better to gain the same end by placing a question mark after the generic name and one after the specific name. It is my opinion, however, that the second method, that of placing the question mark in front of the generic name without a letter break and italicised, is the best style generally.

Example 2.—Everyone agreed that the question mark between the generic and specific names qualifies only the generic name. The meaning of this style of usage corresponds to that in English writing and thinking in general. One taxonomist wondered whether analogy with the style of usage in example 1 would cause anyone to misconstrue the query as referring to the species name, but agreed that it was unlikely. If the question mark followed the generic or any other epithet without a letter-space break, its reference would be clear.

Example 3.—The most confusion arises over whether the style in example 3 or that in example 4 (a) is the correct way to qualify the name of the species. The majority of taxonomists with whom I have discussed the problem favor the style in example 3, wherein the question mark qualifies only the nearest preceding word. The arguments in favour of style 3 versus style 4 (a) follow :

(A) Style 3 corresponds to the normal usage of the question mark in literary and scientific writing. In paleontology it will be correctly understood not only by taxonomists themselves but also by the many stratigraphers who have occasion to use paleontological literature and who are not acquainted with whatever intricate distinctions or esoteric concepts in zoological nomenclature that argue for placing the question mark after the author's name to qualify the species.

(B) In our system of binary nomenclature, the complete name of an organism consists of the generic and of the original valid specific name. *Invalid employments of the species name by later authors are always assumed to be excluded unless contextual evidence or a special indication to the contrary is made.* Such an indication to the contrary is illustrated by the following example : *Fusulina nanicella* Jenkins, 1889 (not Smith, 1885). When using a specific name it is widely recommended that both the author and date be cited whenever they are not clearly evident from the context. This is recommended as a convenience. Such practice is a characteristic of good writing, but a name is not necessarily invalid or meaningless without the citation. (Articles 22 and 25 of the International Rules.)

It should be clearly understood that all of those polled stressed the need for citing the authorship of taxonomic names. There is no disagreement on this point. Of course, the reader could search the literature for determining the authorship of a name just as the reader of scholarly treatises could search for sources of unaccredited quotations or references, but no prudent writer ever imposes that burden on his readers.

(C) Although the Code advises (Article 22) that punctuation *should* not intervene between the name of a species and that of its author, at least one kind of exception is sanctioned (Article 23), as illustrated by *Fusulinella nanicella* (Smith) 1885, wherein a parenthesis does intervene between "*nanicella*" and "Smith". The parenthesis mark and the question mark are partly grammatical and partly rhetorical marks. Whether the interposing of a question mark between the species and author names violates the intention of Article 22 is not entirely clear, although it is assumed that the Code intended to say that such marks as the comma should not separate these names—as it does, for example, in addresses such as Boston, Massachusetts—where a preposition is omitted.

(D) If, as some insist, the name of the author of a species is a *necessary and inseparable* part of the species name, it follows that the system of nomenclature becomes trinary instead of binary, as required by the Code. Accordingly, many names (such as *Fusus gigantea* Rowe, 1900 and *Fusus gigantea* Doe, 1901) that are regarded as homonyms under the binary system of the International Code are actually different names if the author's name is a necessary and inseparable part of the specific name.

It has also been argued that whereas the name of the author may not be entirely restrictive, the year of publication is also required and should also be regarded as a necessary part of the species name. This argument is as logical as that for regarding the author's name as a necessary part of the species name. The trouble here is that even the year may not be restrictive in detail. There is no place to stop in making a name completely restrictive unless the name includes the exact date, time of day, and time zone—an obvious absurdity.

(E) The style of questioning the species by placing the question mark after the author's name seems to be regarded by the majority of those I polled as representing an unimportant and rather esoteric distinction in nomenclature. Whether this majority is correct in its attitude and whether this majority represents taxonomists in general is not for me to conjecture. It does seem a mistake, however, to invent a special construction in writing that so few will comprehend and so many misconstrue.

Example 4 (a).—As already indicated above, a considerable number of taxonomists, though a minority of those I polled, regard this as the only proper location of the question mark for qualifying the species. They argue that the species name is meaningless without a citation of the authorship, and, if I construe their argument correctly, take the opposite view to that expressed in paragraph 3 (B) of my discussion above.

Example 4 (b).—The majority of those interviewed regard the question mark in this position as obviously qualifying the authorship. This attitude is consistent with and an extension of that expressed in the discussion above of example 3.

Although uncertainty of authorship is a rare event in zoological taxonomy, such uncertainty is reported, nevertheless. An example is discussed by Dr. G. A. Cooper in his article " Concerning the authorship of the ' Preliminary notice of the lamellibranch shells of the upper Helderberg, Hamilton, and Chemung groups, etc. Part 2' " (Washington Acad. Sci., Jour., vol. 21, no. 18, pp. 459–467, 1931). A practical angle to the entire question is the fact that a great many taxonomists and practically all general readers will interpret the question mark in this position as qualifying only the immediately preceding word and will continue to do so whether efforts to conventionalise usage 4(a) are justified or not.

Example 5.—The question mark in this position in normal writing would normally reflect on the date alone. In the present confusion it might be misconstrued as qualifying the entire name and citation, or if the author's name and the date are necessary and inseparable parts of the specific name it might be construed as reflecting on the specific name.

Proposed ruling.—It seems to me that the confusion over the style of using the question mark can easily be cleared away by recommending a simple, logical rule. I should like to propose the following one for your consideration : "*A question mark in front of a taxonomic name qualifies the entire name as cited, but if within or at the end of the name it qualifies only the nearest preceding term. If a taxonomic name with a preceding question mark stands within a series of words, the question mark should be italicised and be followed by the generic term without a word-break to prevent ambiguous reference*".

The first part of this rule has the important advantages of simplicity and of self-evident significance, because it agrees with common usage in writing and thinking. It avoids the misunderstanding that generally results from attempts to express esoteric concepts by special construction on common terms or on common usage.

The last part of the rule is offered as perhaps the preferable way of avoiding ambiguity of reference. I am inclined to think that this method is preferable to that of enclosing both the anterior question mark and the name in parentheses.

I am under obligation to Dr. R. W. Brown, Dr. John B. Reeside, Jr. and to other colleagues for discussions that were helpful, whether we viewed the problem alike or not.

CASE No. 27

ARTICLE 25 : PROPOSED INSERTION OF A PROVISION THAT THE DISTRIBUTION OF A MICROFILM DOES NOT CONSTITUTE "PUBLICATION" OF THE PAPER REPRODUCED IN THIS MANNER AND THEREFORE THAT NOTHING CONTAINED IN SUCH A PAPER POSSESSES ANY STATUS IN ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)528)

DOCUMENT 27/1

REPORT ON THE ADOPTION OF A " DECLARATION "

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

The question whether a new name made public by being included in a paper distributed in microfilm but by no other means possesses any status in zoological nomenclature was first brought before the International Commission in a letter dated 6th February, 1951, submitted jointly by (a) the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America and (b) the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology. This application asked the International Commission to rule that for new taxonomic units made public in this way should be ignored until such time as they might appear in printed form.

2. The foregoing application was published in September, 1951, and its publication elicited comment from a number of quarters. At the expiry of the prescribed period a Postal Vote was taken in regard to this matter, the proposal submitted being in the sense of the recommendation submitted. At the time when this vote was taken, the Commission consisted of eighteen members, seventeen of whom voted in favour of banning microfilms as a method of " publishing " new names for taxonomic units ; no vote was received from the eighteenth Commissioner—Professor T. Jaczewski (Poland). This Vote was begun in May, 1952, and was completed in August of that year. A " Declaration " announcing the decision reached would thereupon have been published, if it had not been for the fact that, in returning his vote in favour of the proposal, Professor J. Chester Bradley expressed the view that the action proposed was not sufficiently comprehensive, for it dealt only with the question of the status of a new name distributed in microfilm and made no reference to another important question which might certainly be expected to arise, namely whether a type-selection made for a genus in a paper distributed in this way

constitutes a valid selection for the purposes of Rule (g) in Article 30. To remedy this defect, Professor Bradley proposed the insertion in the *Règles* of a general provision (not limited to the case of microfilms). Professor Bradley's proposal is submitted under Case No. 28, but the portion of his note which is concerned exclusively with the microfilm problem is reproduced in the present Series as Document 27/2.

3. Since the whole of the material relating to this case (other than Professor Chester Bradley's note which, as already explained, is reproduced below as Document 27/2) has already been published in the *Bulletin*, it is not proposed to reprint it here, but it has been thought that the following particulars relating to the sources from which views have been received and the nature of those views will be of convenience in the further consideration of this matter.

4. **Specialists by whom the proposal has been supported :** The specialists by whom the banning of new names distributed only in microfilm is favoured are set out below, where also references are given to the places where the statements received from these specialists have been published :—

(1) The Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America and the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 306–308).

> *Note :* In the annexe to the application submitted, the following particulars were given regarding the support received for the application then submitted :

List of zoologists supporting the petition :

Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America. Members individually polled and unanimous in support, viz. :

Raymond C. Moore, University of Kansas, Lawrence
A. S. Romer, Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Mass.
David H. Dunkle, U.S. National Museum, Washington
S. W. Muller, Stanford University, California
J. Marvin Weller, Walker Museum, University of Chicago
John B. Reeside, Jr., U.S. Geological Survey, Washington
D. L. Frizzell, Rolla, Missouri
A. Myra Keen, Stanford University, California
Katherine V. W. Palmer, Ithaca, New York
J. Brookes Knight, U.S. National Museum, Washington

John W. Wells, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
G. Winston Sinclair, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Individual zoologists in Chicago, in favour of the petition :

Karl P. Schmidt
Fritz Haas
Bryan Patterson
Rainer Zangerl
Rupert Wenzel
William Beecher
Henry S. Dybas
Robert H. Denison
Robert F. Inger
Emmett R. Blake
Austin L. Rand
Melvin A. Taylor, Jr.
Colin Campbell Sanborn
Eugene S. Richardson, Jr.

Nomenclature Committee, Society of Systematic Zoology Members, individually polled ; all replies were approval :

Ernst Mayr, American Museum Natural History
Robert R. Miller, Univ. of Michigan
Robert L. Usinger, Univ. of California
John W. Wells, Cornell Univ.
Ellsworth C. Dougherty, Univ. of California
J. Brookes Knight, U.S. National Museum
E. Raymond Hall, Univ. of Kansas
Richard E. Blackwelder, U.S. National Museum

(2) E. H. Behre (*Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, U.S.A.*) (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 310)

(3) The Committee on Nomenclature of the American Museum of Natural History, New York (1951, *ibid.* **2** : 308)

Note : This communication was signed by :

Mont A. Cazier
Edwin H. Colbert
Norman D. Newall
George H. H. Tate
John T. Zimmer (*Chairman*)

(4) The " Zoological Record " Committee of the Zoological Society of London (1951, *ibid.* 2 : 311–312)

Note : This communication was approved at a meeting of the Committee attended by the following :—

Sheffield A. Neave, C.M.G., O.B.E., D.Sc. (*Chairman*)
William J. Hall, M.C., D.Sc.
Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Sir Norman Kinnear, C.B.
Terence Morrison-Scott, D.S.C., M.A., M.Sc.
Malcolm Smith
C. J. Stubblefield, D.Sc., F.R.S.
L. Harrison-Matthews, Sc.D. (*Scientific Director and Deputy Secretary, Zoological Society of London*)

(5) Robert Mertens (*Natur-Museum und Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M.*) (1951, *ibid.* 6 : 223–224)

5. **Specialists who expressed opposition to the banning of new names made public only by distribution on microfilm :** The two specialists who expressed themselves in opposition to the banning of microfilms as a medium for the publication of new names for taxonomic units were :—

(1) Charles H. Blake (*Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Biology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*) (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 309)

(2) Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) (1952, *ibid.* 2 : 223)

6. **Terms of proposed " Declaration " voted upon by the International Commission :** The following is the text of the proposed *Declaration* on which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature voted by post in 1952 :—

There shall be added to the list of methods prescribed by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology (as recorded in Conclusion

15 (1) (b) of the Official Record of the Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Seventh Meeting held during its Paris Session in July, 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 219)) as being methods of distributing zoological books and papers which do not qualify a new name contained therein as having been made public in a publication (" divulgué dans une publication ") the following new item :

" (iv) the inclusion of a new name in a book or paper distributed in microfilm ".

7. Adoption on 9th August, 1952, of a " Declaration " banning distribution by microfilm as a method for publishing names for taxonomic units : The International Commission adopted on 9th August, 1952, a *Declaration* on the subject of the distribution of microfilms as a method of " publishing " new names for taxonomic units in the terms of the draft quoted in paragraph 6 above. Of the eighteen members of the International Commission there voted in favour of the proposed *Declaration* the following seventeen Commissioners (arranged in the order in which votes were received) : E. M. Hering ; N. D. Riley ; J. R. Dymond ; W. T. Calman ; B. Hankó ; P. Bonnet ; H. E. Vokes ; A. do Amaral ; J. Pearson ; F. Hemming ; J. C. Bradley ; T. Esaki ; H. Lemche ; R. Mertens ; N. R. Stoll ; A. Cabrera ; H. Boschma. No Commissioner voted against the proposed *Declaration* ; no vote was received from T. Jaczewski.

8. Submission of " Declaration " adopted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology for final approval : Under the procedure governing the rendering by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of *Declarations* interpreting the *Règles* an interpretation so given becomes operative immediately, but it is the duty of the International Commission to submit a *Declaration* so adopted to the next International Congress of Zoology for final approval. In accordance with the foregoing procedure the *Declaration* set out in paragraph 6 of the present note adopted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by seventeen votes (one Commissioner not voting) is hereby submitted to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology for final approval.

DOCUMENT 27/2

By **J. CHESTER BRADLEY** (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

Extract from a statement received on 19th July, 1952

(Note : The remainder of the following statement dealt with a distinct, though allied, subject and is reproduced as Document 28/2 of Case No. 28)

So far as the important comments made by Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 223) are concerned, it may be remarked :—

(a) There is nothing in the action about to be taken that will prevent or discourage the dissemination by microfilm of all types of biological information that have no bearing on nomenclature.

(b) At present methods of publishing and distributing microfilm and of securing its continued availability, of storing it, cataloguing, recording and advertising its content, and for its universal facile use have not been developed to the point where matter published in it could be allowed to affect nomenclatural practice without confusion, if not even chaotic, result.

(c) If and when in the future these difficulties are overcome, there would be no inconsistency, should the Commission find it advisable to set a date after which microfilm would be an accepted method of publication.

CASE No. 28

ARTICLE 25 : PROPOSED CO-ORDINATION WITH OTHER PARTS OF THE "RÈGLES" OF THE PROVISION IN, RELATING TO THE NOMENCLATORIAL STATUS OF BOOKS AND PAPERS, THE MANNER OF THE ISSUE OF WHICH DOES NOT SATISFY THE TESTS PRESCRIBED FOR "PUBLICATION"

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)741)

DOCUMENT 28/1

Explanatory Note by **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

In connection with the case (Case No. 27) relating to the proposed banning of distribution in microfilm as a method of publishing names for taxonomic units, I have explained (Document 27/1, paragraph 2) how, during the voting on the proposed *Declaration* relating to the foregoing subject, Professor J. Chester Bradley drew attention to the lack of adequate provision in the *Règles* for ensuring that the provision in Article 25 withholding status in zoological nomenclature from names made public in conditions which do not satisfy the requirements prescribed in that Article covers also provisions in other parts of the *Règles*, e.g. the selection of the type species of a genus under Rule (g) in Article 30.

2. Professor Bradley's proposal for remedying the foregoing defect was contained in a note which, in part, was concerned exclusively with the problem of the status of new names in papers distributed only in microfilm. The latter part of Professor Bradley's note has therefore been reproduced as Document 27/2. The first part of his note, i.e. the part containing his proposal for remedying the defect discussed above, is reproduced below as Document 28/2.

DOCUMENT 28/2

By **J. CHESTER BRADLEY** (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

Extract from a statement received on 19th July, 1952

PROPOSAL OF AN ADDITION TO THE " RÈGLES "

I heartily support the action, but it does not go far enough, since it merely rules that " inclusion of a new name in a book or publication distributed in microfilm " will not qualify the new name.

The question will at once arise, will it qualify selection of the type-species of a genus ? or designation of a lectotype ? or elevation or reduction of rank ? or any of the many other acts that affect nomenclature ?

The same deficiency exists in all provisions of the *Règles* concerning publication, since all are couched in terms that refer solely to whether a new name has or has not been established.

For these reasons I wish to propose that the following addition to the *Règles* be (in substance) adopted at Copenhagen for inclusion in an appropriate Article :—

> " All provisions of these *Règles* relating to what does or does not constitute publication of a new name shall apply with equal force to what does or does not constitute publication of any type of information or notice that, if it were published, would affect nomenclatorial practice."

CASE No. 29

ARTICLE 25, PROVISOS (A) AND (C): PROPOSED REDRAFTING IN ORDER TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT, IN ORDER FOR A NAME TO BECOME AVAILABLE, IT MUST BE PUBLISHED WITH DIAGNOSTIC CHARACTERS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)738)

DOCUMENT 29/1

By the **COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE CHICAGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM**

Extract from a letter dated 15th May, 1952

The Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum proposes modifications of and additions to the Rules of Zoological Nomenclature as below stated. These proposals* are submitted to the International Commission more than one year in advance of the International Zoological Congress at Copenhagen with the request that they be put to a vote at the Section of Nomenclature of said Congress.

Proposal 3

We propose that Article 25 be redrafted to bring out more clearly the fact that the name of a new species or sub-species becomes available only if the description includes diagnostic characters, that is, taxonomic characters that distinguish the newly-described entity from all others known at the time of the publication of the description.

Reasons : The rules in their present form do not distinguish clearly between " diagnosis " (= the statement of characteristic features) and " differential diagnosis " (= the direct comparison with a specifically named similar one related entity).

A description must be *diagnostic*, that is, it must include characters " that distinguish or differentiate " the newly-named form from all others known at the time of the description. On the other hand, a *differential diagnosis*, although recommended in the rules, is not required to assure the availability of a name.

---

* The other proposals referred to here are being published at the appropriate points in the present volume.

Karl P. Schmidt
Dr. Fritz Haas
Loren P. Woods
Robert F. Inger
A. L. Rand (mostly reservations about the form of Proposal 3)
Emmet R. Blake
Rupert L. Wenzel
Colin Campbell Sanborn
Clifford H. Pope
D. Dwight Davis

DOCUMENT 29/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

ON THE DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED IN PRESCRIBING A MINIMUM STANDARD FOR AN " INDICATION " FOR THE PURPOSES OF PROVISO (A) TO ARTICLE 25 IN DOCUMENT 29/1

The proposal brought forward in Document 29/1 by the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum that, in order to acquire availability under Article 25, a new name must be accompanied by a statement of the diagnostic characters which distinguish the species in question from all species known up to that time raises an issue which has always been a cause of difficulty. For this reason, the following brief summary of the efforts which have been made to deal with this subject may be of convenience, since these illustrate the inherent difficulties of this problem and are of value as indicating the pitfalls which must be avoided.

2. **Provision made in Article 25 at the time of the adoption of the "Règles":** At the time of the adoption of the *Règles* at Berlin in 1901—the actual text was not promulgated until early in 1905—the provision in Article 25 was simply that a name, in order to acquire status under the Law of Priority, must, at the time of publication, have been " accompanied by an indication, or a definition or a description " (English translation of relevant portion of Proviso (a) to Article 25).

3. Action taken by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology at Budapest in 1927 : The difficulties involved in determining what should be the minimum requirement in the way of an indication, definition or description which should entitle a specific trivial name to acquire rights under the Law of Priority were examined intermittently by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for a considerable number of years following the end of the 1914–1918 war ; these discussions led the Commission to the view that, so far as names already published were concerned, it must be left to the judgment of specialists to decide whether a given specific (or subspecific) trivial name had been published with an " indication " sufficient to enable it to satisfy the requirements of Proviso (a) to Article 25. The Commission took the view, however, that it would be practicable to require a higher standard for names published in the future than that already laid down in the *Règles* (see paragraph 2 above). The Commission accordingly submitted a recommendation to the Tenth International Congress of Zoology at Budapest in 1927 that a new Proviso (Proviso (c)) should be added to Article 25, this Proviso to apply only to names published after 31st December, 1930. So far as specific trivial names were concerned, this Proviso contained the following provisions :—

> (c) that no . . . . . specific name published after 31st December, 1930, shall have any status of availability (hence of validity) under the Rules, unless and until it is published either :—
>
> (1) with a summary of characters (seu diagnosis ; seu definition ; seu condensed description) which differentiates or distinguishes the . . . . species from other . . . . species ; or
>
> (2) with a definite bibliographic reference to such summary of characters (seu diagnosis ; seu definition ; seu condensed description) ; . . . . .

4. Difficulties experienced in applying the decision taken at Budapest in 1927 : Within seven years of the entry into force of the decision taken at Budapest, the difficulties of applying that decision led to the submission to the Commission of a request for its elucidation. This application came from Professor H. B. Hungerford (then Head of the Department of Entomology at the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas) who, in a letter dated 13th January, 1937, drew attention to the requirement in Proviso (c) to Article 25 that descriptions of new species must be comparative and cited a description (of which he enclosed a photostat) which had recently been published for a new species of insect in which the foregoing requirement had not been observed. Professor Hungerford continued as follows : " During the past year we have seen any number of descriptions such as the enclosed. According to our Rules, may *Erythroneura contrasta* A. & J. [of the description published for which he had enclosed a photostat] be ignored ? If, during the same year but later month, another named the same insect, should not the latter name stand if it fulfils the Rules ? " Professor Hungerford's application was later published in the (then) newly established *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (Hungerford, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 102–103).

5. Other Communications received between 1945 and 1948 : (1) In a document enclosed with a letter dated 17th November, 1945 (see Annexe 1 to the present note), Professor Chester Bradley analysed the description published by Auton & Johnson for *Erythroneura contrasta* (the description cited by Professor Hungerford) and expressed the view that this description satisfied the requirements of Proviso (c) to Article 25, " unless other species can be produced that fit the description ", a contingency which he considered unlikely in view of the importance attached to the genitalia in this group and the detailed description given for these organs for the above species by the authors cited above. Thus, Professor Bradley's view was that the essential requirement of Proviso (c) was that a new description must contain particulars which would enable the species in question to be separated from all previously described species and that it was not an essential part of this Proviso that an explicit comparison should be made with other species. (2) A few months later a different view was expressed in a proposal submitted (under cover of a letter dated 6th March, 1946, from Dr. Ernst Mayr) by the Committee on Nomenclature of the American Museum of Natural History, New York (see Annexe 2 to the present note). Under this proposal paragraph (1) of Proviso (c) ought, it was suggested, to be redrafted to provide " that a definite comparison with a known near relative be an obligatory part of the original description of any new species " ; it was proposed that the revised version of Proviso (c) should provide " that all names be considered *nomina nuda* which lack in the original description a reference by name to a near relative and mention of diagnostic characters which differentiate or distinguish the genus or the species from other genera or species ". (3) In a later letter (dated 24th June, 1946, for an extract of the relevant portion of which see Annexe 3 to the present note), Dr. Mayr stated that some of the correspondents of the Nomenclature Committee of the Museum had expressed the opinion that it would be simpler if the revised provision were to require " that the description must be fully diagnostic in regard to all other known genera, species or subspecies ". This change " would at once kill all the careless and meaningless descriptions which place all the work on subsequent revisers ". (4) An entirely different view was expressed in a communication (received on 17th February, 1947) from the late Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (reproduced in Annexe 4 to the present note) in which he brought forward examples of the absurdities—as they appeared to him—which would arise if Proviso (c) to Article 25 were to be amended so as to require that the description of a new taxonomic unit should contain an explicit reference to, and comparison with, some specified, previously described, such unit. (5) Shortly afterwards (in a letter dated 8th April, 1947) the late Dr. Th. Mortensen took up a view similar to that expressed (see (1) above) by Professor Chester Bradley, stating : " *Erythroneura contrasta* Auton & Johnson should stand ".

6. Discussion in Paris in 1948 : The present problem was considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on 22nd July, 1948, at the Fourth Meeting of its Paris Session. In view of the importance of this subject and of the differences of opinion that had been expressed—

though not in Paris—in regard to it, a full summary of the discussion which took place was included in the *Official Record of the Proceedings* of the International Commission which was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 70–71). Since this discussion traversed the same ground as that covered by the present application from the Chicago Natural History Museum, it is considered that it will be of assistance to the consideration of this matter to reprint below the Official Record of the Paris discussion.

> **Article 25, Proviso (c) (1) : the expression " which differentiate . . ."**
>
> 7. THE COMMISSION considered next the expression " with a summary of characters which differentiate or distinguish the genus or species from other genera or species," as used in Section (1) to Proviso (c) to Article 25. Professor H. B. Hungerford (U.S.A.) (Commission File Z.N.(S.) 61) had asked whether under these words, it was necessary that a description of a new species, in order to make the new name available, must contain an express reference to, and a comparison with, some previously published species (see Hungerford, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 102–103).
>
> In the discussion which ensued, it was generally agreed that, though well-intentioned, this provision in Article 25 was open to the objection that it invalidated otherwise properly published names on a purely technical nomenclatorial ground. It was a ritualistic provision which should be modified in conformity with the principle adopted in dealing with the expression " definite bibliographic reference ". What was needed was that this provision should require a higher standard for names published after 31st December, 1930, than for names published before that date (when all that was required was that the new name should be published with an " indication, definition or description "). The provision in question should, however, be less rigorous than that contained in the existing Section (1) to Proviso (c). It was pointed out that, if the requirement that the description should be comparative were to be deleted, the only distinction which could be drawn in this matter between names published on or after 1st January, 1931, and names published before 1st January, 1931, was between names which, when first published, had been accompanied by words giving particulars of characters and those which depended for their availability, in the case of generic names, solely upon the designation or citation of a type species, and, in the case of the trivial names of species or subspecies, solely upon an accompanying figure or illustration.

7. **The decision reached in Paris in 1948 :** In the light of the discussion summarised above, the International Commission in Paris in 1948 adopted the following recommendation (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 71), which was later approved by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology (1950, *ibid.* **85** : 69, 76, 131).

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) the deletion of Section (1) of Proviso (c) to Article 25 and the insertion in its place of a new Section (1) as follows :—

> " with a statement in words indicating the characters of the genus, species or subspecies concerned."

(2) to insert a *Recommandation* to Proviso (c) (1), urging authors, when drawing up descriptions of new genera, subgenera, species or subspecies to give not only an absolute, but also a comparative, description thereof, by indicating :—

  (a) in the case of a generic or subgeneric name, the characters which separate the genus or subgenus concerned from the previously described genus or subgenus to which it is considered that the new genus or subgenus is most closely allied ;

  (b) in the case of a specific name, the characters which separate the new species from the previously described species to which it is considered to be most closely allied, and, if that is a little-known species, the characters which separate the new species from a well-known or common species included in the genus ;

  (c) in the case of a subspecific name, the characters which distinguish the new subspecies from the subspecies to which it is considered to be most closely allied, and, if that is a little-known subspecies, the characters which distinguish the new subspecies from a well-known or common subspecies of the species concerned.

8. **Concluding observations :** Everyone will, I am confident, agree with the object of the amendment to Article 25 made by the Budapest Congress in 1927 and the similar object entertained by the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum in the application which it has now submitted. For, as every taxonomist knows from experience, badly prepared descriptions containing no comparison with allied species throw a heavy burden (as Dr. Mayr has pointed out) on subsequent revisers and the elucidation of such descriptions involves a large expenditure of time which could much more profitably be devoted to more valuable studies. The only question upon which opinion may differ is the extent to which it is desirable or practicable to make the inclusion of diagnostic characters of specified types an essential condition for the acquisition by a name of availability under the Law of Priority. There are, it seems to me, several important considerations which require to be carefully weighed before any substantial change is made in the direction suggested. These are : (1) To what extent is it likely that zoologists generally would comply with more rigorous conditions than those agreed upon in Paris, if such were now to be adopted ? (2) Is there a risk that the rejection of names which did not satisfy the proposed more rigorous conditions would lead to an even greater waste of time by subsequent revisers in searching the

later literature for the first occasion after the publication of a rejected name on which that name was used by an author who indubitably cited diagnostic characters for the species in question ? (3) Is there not a likelihood that a revised provision of the kind suggested would be open to criticism on the ground that—to use the expression originally coined by Dr. J. Brookes Knight of Washington—it imposed a " ritualistic " condition for the rejection of a name and one which ought not to find a place in the portion of the *Règles* which regulates the availability of names ? (4) Is it not likely that the introduction into the *Règles* of a subjective test such as that involved in determining whether or not a given original description was sufficiently " diagnostic " to satisfy the requirements of the new provision would lead to increased instability in nomenclature through disagreement among specialists, a situation which could only be brought to an end either by the submission to the International Commission of an application for the suppression of the name concerned or for a ruling as to whether or not the original description was or was not sufficiently diagnostic to satisfy the requirements of the new provision ? (5) Would it be practicable to require that, in order to acquire availability, a name should be published with a comparison with all other taxonomic units known at that time ? For would not this mean that every description of a new species would need to be accompanied by comparisons separating it from all members of the genus—a task which in the case of a large genus would be extremely complicated and in the case of a genus for which no recent revision had been published would involve the preparation of such a revision before the new genus could be described ? (6) Finally, must it not be admitted that the expression " all others known at the time of the time of the description " would, if adopted, impose on the systematist a quite impossible task, for even when such periodicals as the *Zoological Record* are as up to date as it is possible to make them, the latest volume—from which information about the latest published names may be obtained—always relates to a period at least a year in the past ? Question (4) is clearly one of great importance, since on the one hand the *Règles* should certainly be such as to make it possible, if necessary, with the help of the International Commission, to secure a definite ruling whether a given name is an objectively available name but, equally clearly, they should not be such that, in order to terminate instability and lack of uniformity in the nomenclature of any given group, it would be necessary to ask the International Commission for a definitive ruling as to whether a given name was published with a sufficiently diagnostic description. Such a resort to the International Commission would, in my opinion, be open to strong objection, involving it in a decision on a question of a purely taxonomic character on which it would be quite inappropriate to look for a ruling from the Commission. For, while the Commission is fitted to give rulings on objective questions of fact such as whether a given name was duly " published " or, when published, was " accompanied by statement in words indicating the characters of the " taxonomic unit concerned, it is not fitted to give—and I should doubt its willingness to give—a ruling on a question involving only a subjective judgment on a matter not essentially concerned with nomenclature at all. Questions (5) and (6) also raise important issues, for it is clearly undesirable to make the writing of a new description unduly cumbrous or laborious and something which could not even be attempted except in a few institutions in different parts of the world containing virtually complete collections of current serial publications. Indeed, with the divisions which at present separate zoologists into two geographical groups, the institution of such a rule in the form in which it has actually been proposed would mean that years might well elapse before it was possible to determine whether a given specific name satisfied the new rule—and was therefore an available name—owing to the utter impracticability of ascertaining whether in the other half of the world a description had been published for some allied species with which (inevitably) no comparison had been given in the original description.

ANNEXE 1 TO DOCUMENT 29/2

View expressed by Professor **J. CHESTER BRADLEY**
(*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

Extract from a statement enclosed with a letter dated 17th November, 1945

The requirement of Article 25 (c) referred to is that the name must be " published with a summary of characters (seu diagnosis ; seu definition ; seu condensed description) which differentiate or distinguish the genus or the species from other genera or species ".

The purpose of the quoted description of *Erythroneura contrasta* seems to have been to differentiate this species from others, and it does so unless other species can be produced that fit the description. In view of the importance attached to the male genitalia in this genus, and of the detailed description of those organs by Auten and Johnson it may be assumed that this is not the case, and it would certainly require a specialist to prove the contrary.

It may be noted that the wording of Article 25 (c) is " from other genera or species " not " from all other genera or species " and this is a matter of importance. No one familiar with the difficulties inherent in taxonomic research would assume that all authors could in all cases be successful in differentiating any given form from all others : the progress of taxonomy cannot always wait until all genera or species in the world fauna of a given group are known with certainty before an author can proceed to describe a new form, and he may err in his judgment that the description he produces truly differentiates it from *all* others. Conditions would become chaotic if it were allowed that any name published after 1930 were liable to be invalidated in case some author were to discover or assume to discover that there existed some other genus or species from which the description did not fully differentiate it. All that can reasonably be required or even expected is that the author shall have made an honest effort to provide a description that will truly differentiate the genus or species from at least those others known to occur or likely to occur in the same faunal area.

Article 25 (c) uses the expression " condensed description ". Since it is not possible to establish any standard by which it can be determined whether or not a description is condensed, nor to determine the point at which it becomes so condensed that it no longer serves to differentiate the species from others, this matter must in practice be left to the author of the species. It would seem that the word " condensed " should be construed rather as an admonition, advising authors toward what they should strive, rather than as a requirement that must be precisely met.

Instances are supposed to have occurred of an author publishing a " description " of new species but purposely withholding statement of diagnostic characters in order that his colleagues should not be advised of the facts and thus able to " trespass " upon what he conceived of as his pre-empted taxonomic field. When it is borne in mind that such an author could publish several truthful but identical descriptions of different new species of the same genus (by omitting their distinguishing characters) and that if this had been done before 1931 the new species would have met the requirements of Article 25, the significance of the phrase " which differentiate or distinguish the genus or species from other genera or species " becomes apparent.

ANNEXE 2 TO DOCUMENT 29/2

Proposal submitted by the **COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK**

Enclosure to a letter dated 6th March, 1946, from Dr. ERNST MAYR,
Chairman

Whereas the intent of Article 25, section c, paragraph 1 has been variously interpreted by different taxonomic workers, with the result that the validity of many names published after 31st December, 1930, is in doubt.

Therefore be it resolved that the International Commission be requested to revise this Article in order to eliminate the present ambiguous wording, and

That it be stated in the new version of Article 25, section c, paragraph 1, that a definite comparison with a known near relative be an obligatory part of the original description, and

That all names be considered *nomina nuda*, which lack in the original publication a reference by name to a near relative and mention of diagnostic characters which differentiate or distinguish the genus or the species from other genera or species.

Committee on Nomenclature
The American Museum of Natural History, N.Y.

Edwin H. Colbert
Willis J. Gertsch
George H. H. Tate
John T. Zimmer
Ernst Mayr, *Chairman.*

Enclosure to statement furnished by the Committee on Nomenclature of the American Museum of Natural History

Note : Annexed to the statement furnished by the American Museum of Natural History was a list containing the signatures of the zoologists who have either voted for, or against the proposed solution.

2. Those who have voted in favour of the proposal were :—

Harold E. Anthony
George G. Goodwin
G. H. H. Tate
John E. Hill
Charles H. Falkenbach
Morris Skinner
Robert C. Murphy
John T. Zimmer
Ernst Mayr
James P. Chapin
Charles E. O'Brien
E. Thomas Gilliard
Charles K. Nichols
Jean Delacour
Charles M. Bogert
James A. Oliver
C. M. Breder
Francesca LaMonte
Mont A. Cazier
Willis J. Gertsch
Annette L. Bacon
Herbert F. Schwarz
William P. Comstock

3. Those who have voted against the proposal were :—

Dean Amadon
John T. Nichols
G. G. Simpson
Edwin Colbert
Norman Newell
Otto Haas
Bobb Schaeffer
Rachel Nichols
Brooks Ellis
Angelina Messina

ANNEXE 3 TO DOCUMENT 29/2

Supplementary statement furnished by **DR. ERNST MAYR**
(*American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

Extract from a letter dated 24th June, 1946

In regard to the resolution concerning the revised wording of Article 25, Section c, Paragraph 1, some doubt has arisen among some of our correspondents whether it would not be more simple merely to demand that the description must be fully diagnostic in regard to all other known genera, species, or subspecies. This would at once kill all the careless and meaningless descriptions which place all the work on subsequent revisers.

ANNEXE 4 TO DOCUMENT 29/2

View expressed by the late Professor **LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO**
(*University of Parma, Italy*)

Statement received on 17th February, 1947

ON THE STATUS, UNDER ARTICLE 25 OF THE INTERNATIONAL CODE, OF SPECIFIC NAMES PUBLISHED WITH DESCRIPTIONS BUT WITHOUT COMPARISON WITH ALLIED SPECIES (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 102).

Proviso (c) to Article 25 does not mean, in my opinion, that new species must be compared with others, but that they must be described with a summary of characters which differentiate or distinguish the species from other species.

That is not the same thing. It is enough, in my opinion, that I give the characters differentiating the species from others, without making an explicit comparison.

Were it not so, we would meet with several absurdities.

For instance : Take a genus, like *Araneus* which includes several hundreds of species. If I had to describe a new species, I should, therefore, need to compare it with hundreds of other species : that is not possible : every description would become a complete monograph of the genus. Or had I to compare the new species with *some* other species ; which should they be ? Logically, with those that are closer akin, but that is a subject of personal valuation, a subject of systematics, not of nomenclature, and one upon which nomenclature laws cannot rule. So, we could have the situation that a new *Araneus*, say, from New Zealand might legitimately be named upon a simple comparison with the European *A. diadematus:* it is clear that such a comparison would have no value, as there may be a score of *Araneus* much more allied to the new one than *A. diadematus*, with which no comparison would have been made nor be possible, and yet the described species, by no means recognisable, would be valid, whereas if no explicit comparison were made, it would not be valid even if the description (and naming) of the same species were made with great accuracy in a way that would enable anyone to compare the species with every other species of the genus.

That would be absurd.

Take another instance.

In some animals, for instance in some groups, ♂ and ♀ are quite different, and are not comparable with one another. Suppose we have a couple of species of such and such a group, all represented by ♂♂ only. Later, I find a ♀, the first known of the genus. It is from quite a different country than the other species, so I can assume it is new. But I cannot compare it with the other species, because, though its characters are very different, they are simply sexual ones. Should then my species be invalid ? Of course not : it is enough, for the letter and the spirit of proviso (c), that I describe the characters that may differentiate the species. It is not said that a comparison is necessary—nor am I obliged myself to make such a comparison.

Therefore *I think that, if a species is described with the differentiating characters*, for instance, as in the case citated of *Erythroneura contrasta* with the details of the genitalia, which are ordinarily peculiar to each species, *so that any one can make the necessary comparisons, the name given to the species is valid even though the author did not make an explicit comparison with other species.*

CASE No. 30

ARTICLE 25, PROVISOS (A) AND (C): PROPOSED INSERTION OF A PROVISION DENYING AVAILABILITY IN THE CASE OF THE TRIVIAL NAME OF ANY FOSSIL SPECIES UNLESS AT THE TIME OF THE PUBLICATION OF THAT NAME THERE WAS PUBLISHED ALSO A FIGURE OF THE SPECIES IN QUESTION

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)693)

DOCUMENT 30/1

By **C. J. STUBBLEFIELD,** D.Sc., F.R.S. (*Geological Survey and Museum, London*), **L. R. COX,** Sc.D., F.R.S. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*), and **R. V. MELVILLE,** M.A. (*Geological Survey and Museum, London*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 17th August, 1952

A decision internationally agreed among geologists is reported in the C.R. 2nd Internat. Geol. Congress (Bologna 1881), 1882, p. 198 that for fossils " à l'avenir, pour les noms spécifiques, la priorité ne sera irrevocablement acquise que lorsque l'espèce aura été non seulement décrite, mais figurée."

2. The Bologna decision is accepted by Prof. Dr. R. Richter, a former member of the ICZN, in the following publications: " Einführung in der Zoologische Nomenklatur durch Erlaüterung der Internationalen Regeln " (2nd Ed.), Frankfurt a.M., 1948, p. 154 ; *Senckenbergiana*, **31** : Nos. 5/6, 1950, p. 175 ; R. & N. Richter, *ibid.*, **32** : Nos. 1/4, 1950, p. 232 ; R. Richter " Die Illegitimetät bilder-losen Arten und Gattungen in der Paläontologie ", *ibid.*, **33** : Nos. 1/3, 1952, pp. 75–77.

3. (i) The Société Géologiques de France states in its rules, Chapter VII, Article 61 (*Bull. Soc. geol. France*, (4), **24** : 1924, p. 6) "Aucun nom nouveau d'espèce fossile ne peut être inséré dans les publications de la Société s'il n'est pas accompagné d'une figure et d'une description assez complète pour bien caracéteriser l'espèce ".

(ii) The instructions for authors contributing to the *Mémoires paléontologiques suisses* state, under Rule 17 (p. 6) " L'établissement d'une nouvelle espèce non accompagnée d'une figure n'est pas admise. On joindra au texte descriptif une nouvelle figure si l'on ne peut pas se referer a une figure déjà existante."

4. In living animals it may be possible, when dealing with newly found material, to recognise the diagnostic characters of a given species from a written description only. This is seldom the case with fossils when the specific identity of the material may be obscured by differences in preservation.

5. The International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature state under Article 39 " From January 1st, 1912, the name of a new taxonomic group of fossil plants is not conceived as validly published unless it is accompanied by illustrations or figures showing the essential characters, in addition to the description or by a reference to a previously and effectively published illustration or figure."

6. Accordingly the Commission is asked to recommend to the International Zoological Congress that Article 25 of the *Règles* (The Law of Priority) be amended by inserting the provision that no fossil species shall have any status of availability unless published with a figure or with reference to a previously published figure.

7. The Commission is further requested that the foregoing provision should be made retrospective to the date of publication of the resolution adopted by the Bologna Congress quoted in Paragraph 1 of the present Application and it is suggested that the date on which the Bologna decision became effective be determined as 1st January, 1883.

8. As regards names published for genera of fossils, it is asked that the revised Articles should provide that no such name published after the date specified in Paragraph 7 above should have any rights under The Law of Priority, unless the species which was designated as the type species of the genus in question, or was later selected as such, has been figured.

9. In order that the present proposal which is submitted solely in the interests of palaeontological work may not cause inconvenience or confusion among workers on recent species of animals, it is suggested that the provisions asked for in paragraphs 7 and 8 above shall not deprive the specific and generic names affected of their powers under the laws of homonymy.

Note by the Secretary: I should explain that, when in August, 1952, Dr. Stubblefield communicated the foregoing application, he kindly sent me also the draft of a Resolution in regard to the subject dealt with in it which it was then proposed should be submitted to the Council of the Nineteenth International Geological Congress then due to meet shortly afterwards at Algiers. I have not, however, received any notification from the authorities of the Congress as to what transpired in regard to this matter. (intl'd) F. H., 29th May, 1952.

DOCUMENT 30/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

ARTICLES 25 AND 30 : PROPOSED ADDITION OF " RECOMMANDATIONS " DESIGNED TO PROMOTE THE PUBLICATION OF FIGURES WHENEVER NAMES ARE GIVEN TO SPECIES OR TAXONOMIC UNITS OF LOWER RANK AND TO ENSURE THAT, SO FAR AS POSSIBLE, THE SPECIES DESIGNATED, INDICATED, OR SELECTED AS THE TYPE SPECIES OF GENERA SHALL BE SPECIES FOR WHICH FIGURES HAVE BEEN PUBLISHED

In the immediately preceding document (Document 30/1), Dr. G. J. Stubblefield, with Dr. L. R. Cox and Mr. R. V. Melville, recommends that a provision should be inserted in Article 25, Proviso (a), depriving of status in zoological nomenclature (1) any name published for a Fossil species without a figure since 31st December, 1882, and (2) any name published for a genus of fossils since the foregoing date, the type species of which has not been figured.

2. The above application is conceived solely in the interests of palaeontological work and is not intended—as Dr. Stubblefield has made clear—to modify the existing position of names given to Recent species or to genera for such species. For otherwise the provision suggested would, if approved, impose a serious additional burden upon neontologists when considering the status, from the standpoint af the Law of Homonymy, (1) of any generic name and (2) of any specific trivial name applicable to a Recent species either originally described in, or currently placed in, a genus containing Fossil as well as Recent species. Of the foregoing difficulties No. (1) would be a serious one from the standpoint of any author who wished to ensure that a name which he proposed to publish as a generic name was an available name in the sense that it was not a junior homonym of a nomenclatorially available generic name already published ; for, if the application now submitted were to be approved without full safeguards, the neontologist in such a case would be placed in great difficulty if he found, say, on consulting (say) Neave's *Nomenclator Zoologicus* that the name which he proposed to use for his new genus had already been used in palaeontological literature. In such a case the neontologist concerned would no longer be able thereby to see at once that the name which he proposed to use was not an available name, since the older generic name published for a Fossil species might not be an available name, being based upon a type species which had not been figured at the time when it was named. In order to settle a problem of this kind, a neontologist would therefore need

both (a) to ascertain what was the type species of the genus of fossils concerned, a question which might well be a matter of great difficulty in the case of the names of genera published before 1st January, 1931, without designated or indicated type species—and, having done so, (b) to determine whether that species had been figured either at the time when it was first named or when it was designated as the type species of the genus concerned or at some intermediate date. These are tasks which would require for the neontologist a knowledge of palaeontological literature which it would be quite unreasonable to expect and would necessitate access to a well-equipped palaeontological library which might often not be available. It cannot, therefore, I think, be contested that, if any provision were to be inserted in the *Règles* on the lines suggested in Document 30/1, that provision would need to preserve for the purpose of determining the nomenclatorial status of names given to Recent genera and Recent species, the status under the Law of Homonymy of names given to Fossil genera and Fossil species which were validly published and were available names in all respects except that they did not satisfy the test in regard to the possession of published figures which it is the object of the application under consideration to make an essential requirement.

3. An aspect of the problem which is not touched upon in the application reproduced in Document 30/1 is the provision to be made for the case where —in the subjective view of taxonomists (either palaeontologists or neontologists or both)—a genus contains both Recent and Fossil species. For it would clearly be out of the question to permit a situation to arise under which either (1) a genus has two valid names, one for palaeontologists and the other for neontologists, or (2) the availability of a given generic name would depend upon the subjective view of taxonomists as to whether or not all its contained species were Fossil species.

4. At this point it may usefully be recalled that in times gone by a proposal similar to that now submitted by Dr. Stubblefield and his colleagues was strongly advocated for adoption in relation to the names of recent genera and recent species. For example, before the first World War such a proposal was urged at the International Entomological Congress held at Oxford. Under the enthusiastic leadership of the late M. Charles Oberthur the Congress was invited to subscribe to the formula : " Pas de bonne figure, pas de nom valable ". The proposal received, however, no substantial measure of support, partly (1) because it was felt that, while it was possible for a rich man to publish —as M. Oberthur habitually did—magnificent figures for all new species that he described, to do so would be an impossible (because inequitable) requirement to impose upon less favourably placed workers and upon struggling serial publications, and partly (2) because it was felt that the word " bonne " as used in the expression " bonne figure " constituted a fatal flaw in the proposal. For a hopeless dilemma was disclosed. On the one hand the inclusion of a qualifying adjective such as " bonne " would have introduced a subjective element of the most dangerous kind owing to the innumerable—and, in the circumstances contemplated, perfectly legitimate—opportunities which it would have provided for argument whether a given published figure was sufficiently good to clothe with availability the name given to the species for which it was published. On the other hand, the entire purpose of the proposal would be destroyed if the suggested provision could be circumvented by the publication of cheaply reproduced and largely unrecognisable figures.

5. **An alternative suggestion :** In view of the difficulties discussed above, I should like to put forward for consideration the following alternative proposals :—

(1) that a *Recommandation* should be added to Proviso (a) to Article 25 strongly urging authors, editors of serial publications and others concerned with the production of books dealing with zoological and palaeontological subjects to do everything possible within the financial means at their disposal to publish a recognisable figure of any species or subspecies for which they may publish a new name.

(2) that a *Recommandation* should be added to Proviso (a) urging authors when establishing new nominal genera to avoid designating or indicating as the type species a species for which a satisfactory figure is not published at the same time or for which a figure has not already been published ;

(3) that a *Recommandation* similar to that suggested in (2) above should be added to Rule (g) in Article 30 in relation to the selection of the type species of nominal genera ;

(4) that, if (as is understood to be the case) the application now reproduced as Document 30/1 has been prompted, in part, by a desire to deprive of availability names published by particular authors in the past without figures for Fossil species which on that account are held by palaeontologists to be difficult or impossible to recognise, particulars of the cases concerned should be submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature with a view to the suppression of the names concerned under the plenary powers.

CASE No. 31

ARTICLE 25 : QUESTION WHETHER A NAME GIVEN TO A NOMINAL GENUS, THE TYPE SPECIMEN OF THE TYPE SPECIES OF WHICH IS A PATHOLOGICAL MONSTROSITY SHOULD BE GIVEN ANY STATUS OF AVAILABILITY

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)719)

DOCUMENT 31/1

By **W. J. ARKELL,** M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.
(*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge*)

Extract from a letter dated 22nd October, 1952

A very well-known genus of large Lias ammonites has always been called *Asteroceras*, but owing to a nomenclatural twist (type designation) this name has had to be used for something else, which originally was only a part of *Asteroceras* anct. For the rest, and main section, of *Asteroceras* anct., it has been said that *Caenisites* Buchman is available, for its inner whorls are said to resemble those of *Asteroceras* anct. But *Caenisites* is, as usual with Buchman, based on a single monotype only, and that is a pathological monstrosity the published photographs of which show none of the characters of *Asteroceras* anct.

The question is, must I accept *C. caenus* Buchman, in the *Treatise* [on Invertebrate Paleontology], as type species, on the grounds that one specialist has proclaimed his belief that it belongs to *Asteroceras* anct ? What I want to do is to choose one of the well-known species of *Asteroceras* anct., give it a new name, and apply to have *Caenisites* put on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names.*

DOCUMENT 31/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

The immediately preceding letter from Dr. W. J. Arkell is no more than a preliminary communication in regard to a particular case which has not yet been submitted to the International Commission. Attention is, however, drawn to this case at this point, since it raises an issue which could be dealt with by the Commission under its plenary powers, if it so thought fit, but on which no clear ruling is to be found in the *Règles*.

2. It may be thought convenient to dispose of the question of principle at Copenhagen. The question for consideration is :—

(1) whether a name given to a nominal genus the type specimen of the type species of which is a pathological monstrosity should be treated as a *nomen dubium* and therefore a name which is nomenclatorially a danger in the sense (a) that at any time any author can claim to recognise the type species and thus lead to confusion and lack of uniformity in nomenclature by seeking to bring the name in question into use, and (b) that it preoccupies, as a senior homonym, any later use of the generic name in question ;

or

(2) whether there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision that, where the type specimen of the type species of a nominal genus is a pathological monstrosity, the name given to that nominal genus shall possess no status in nomenclature (or, alternatively shall possess no status under the Law of Priority, though retaining its status under the Law of Homonymy, thus rendering any later use of that name invalid as a junior homonym).

CASE No. 32

ARTICLE 25 : PROPOSED INSERTION OF A PROVISION THAT A NAME PUBLISHED BY AN AUTHOR WHO MADE IT CLEAR THAT HIS OBJECT IN SO DOING WAS SOME PURPOSE OTHER THAN THAT OF PROVIDING A NAME FOR USE IN ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE POSSESSES NO STATUS OF AVAILABILITY

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)668)

DOCUMENT No. 32/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

In a paper published in May, 1951 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 208–210), Dr. W. J. Arkell asked for a ruling on the question whether the generic name *Arieticeras* as published by Quenstedt in 1883 possessed availability under Article 25, having regard to the fact that Quenstedt, who was opposed to the multiplication of ammonite genera, made it clear that he was doing no more than illustrate the sort of genus-splitting that some authors favoured and that it was not his intention to bring forward the name *Arieticeras* for use in zoological nomenclature.

2. When I first considered this matter, I inclined to the view that it would introduce an undesirable element of subjective judgment into the *Règles* if a provision were to be inserted requiring that, in order to secure the status of availability, a name not only must have been duly published (a) with at least an " indication " and (b) by a binominal author, but must also in addition have been published in such a way as to make it clear that the name in question was intended for use in zoological nomenclature (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 211–213).

3. From the comments subsequently received it became clear that the general feeling of workers was in favour of rejecting any name published by an author in circumstances which made it clear that his object in publishing the name was some purpose other than the provision of a name for use in zoological nomenclature. The comments received were the following : (1) Engel (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 337) ; (2) Oldroyd (1952, *ibid.* **6** : 245) ; (3) Hölder (*ibid.* **6** : 245) ; (4) Baily (*ibid.* **6** : 246) ; (5) Haas (*ibid.* **6** : 246) ; (6) Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Palaeontology in America (not yet published). Of the foregoing, (a) Engel, A. Myra Keen and Siemon

Muller (the two latter as members of the Joint Committee) agreed with Arkell that the name *Arieticeras* should be accepted as from Quenstedt, notwithstanding his remarks at the time when he published this name. (b) Oldroyd, Hölder, Baily, Haas, and Reeside (through the Joint Committee) considered that in the circumstances in which this name was published it should be rejected as having no status of availability.

4. In the light of the opinions so expressed I altered my view on this subject and suggested that the problem raised by a name such as *Arieticeras* Quenstedt should be dealt with on lines similar to those already adopted in the somewhat parallel case where, in the opinion of taxonomists, a genus is based upon a misidentified type species. I accordingly suggested that the problem might be dealt with by the insertion in Article 25 of a provision prescribing that it is to be assumed that an author who publishes a new name does so for use in zoological nomenclature, save that, where any specialist is of the opinion that a given name was not published with the foregoing intention, he should refer the case to the Commission, which, if satisfied that the objection to the name is well founded, may direct that the name in question is to be treated as having no availability in zoological nomenclature (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 247–249).

5. It may be felt that in some of the probably small number of cases of the kind here under discussion the author concerned made it so clear that he did not intend the name which he was publishing to be used in zoological nomenclature that it would be preferable to place the onus of proof not upon those zoologists who consider that the name should be rejected but upon those who consider that it should be accepted. In case this view finds favour, the following solution is suggested as an alternative to that suggested in paragraph 4 above, namely that there should be inserted in Article 25 a provision prescribing (a) that an author who publishes a name is to be assumed to have done so for use in zoological nomenclature, except where that author, when publishing the name in question makes it clear that the foregoing was not his object, (b) that, where it is clear that a given name was not intended for use in zoological nomenclature, that name shall possess no status under either the Law of Priority or the Law of Homonymy, and (c) that any case where it is not clear whether the name in question was intended for use in zoological nomenclature should be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision.

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

CONTENTS

(continued from front wrapper)

This Part contains the documents relating to the six cases which have been prepared for the Copenhagen Discussions under the Case Numbers 27 to 32.

These cases all relate to various aspects of Article 25 of the *Règles*. The titles of these cases are given on pp. 299–300.

Triple-Part 3/5 (Emendation of names)

It is regretted that technical reproduction difficulties are still holding up the publication of this Part. Publication is expected shortly after the present Part.

Printed in England by Metcalfe & Cooper Limited, 10-24 Scrutton St., London E C 2

VOLUME 10. Double Part 10/11 24th July, 1953
Pp. 299—354

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of
THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by
FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Copenhagen Discussions, Case No. 33 : Article 25 : status to be accorded to generic names and trivial names published as " nomina nuda " in synonymies

LONDON:
Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1953

Price One Guinea
(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)
Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (6th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Double-Part 10/11 (pp. 299–354) 24*th* July, 1953

CASE No. 33

ARTICLE 25: QUESTION OF THE STATUS TO BE ACCORDED TO GENERIC NAMES AND TRIVIAL NAMES PUBLISHED AS "NOMINA NUDA" IN SYNONYMIES

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)372)

DOCUMENT 33/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

THE GENERAL PROBLEM RELATING TO THE STATUS TO BE ACCORDED TO ZOOLOGICAL NAMES PUBLISHED AS "NOMINA NUDA" IN SYNONYMIES

I have already explained in the Report on Case No. 7 how in 1948 I was asked, as Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, to carry out an investigation, in conjunction with interested specialists, into the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which was first published in a generic synonymy. I have explained also how in September, 1950, Dr. Ernst Mayr raised the wider issue of the status of any zoological name, whether a generic name or a trivial name, published without an indication in a synonymy and how I took the view that, as Dr. Mayr's proposal, if approved, would render unnecessary any further consideration of the more limited issue on which in 1948 I had been asked to furnish a Report, the best course would be to group under the present wider issue not only all the documents which had been received in regard to it, but also all the documents which were received in response to the appeal which I made at the beginning of 1952 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 109–118) for assistance and advice from interested specialists on the limited issue which had been referred to me in 1948. I should add that I have included here also statements which I received from certain specialists in response to a short note which I wrote shortly after the receipt of Dr. Mayr's paper. This latter was published in the following serial publications: (1) *Journal of Palaeontology*; (2) the *Geological Magazine*. The reason why only these two publications were asked to publish this note was to ensure that the important issues raised by Dr. Mayr should be brought prominently to the attention of palaeontologists; it was considered that, so far as neontologists were concerned, these would be brought adequately to attention, partly by the wide circulation given to Dr. Mayr's paper in manuscript and partly by its eventual publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature.* It will be recalled also that in the general appeal for advice and assistance contained in my paper of 1952 (referred to above) attention was drawn not only to the limited issue raised in 1948 but also to the wider problem later raised by Dr. Mayr. Finally, I should note that, prior to the receipt of Dr. Mayr's paper of 1950, representations regarding the Paris interpretation of *Opinion* 4 (which forms an important part of the argument advanced by Dr. Mayr) had been received from Mr. J. E. Collin (Newmarket, England) and others. This subject would, therefore, in any case have been placed on the Agenda for discussion at Copenhagen. The papers received in this way are also included in the present Series. The entire series of papers has been arranged chronologically.

2. The fact that the documents now submitted owe their origin to a number of independent sources naturally produces a somewhat ragged appearance and might have rendered difficult the weighing of the views expressed if these had shown any marked differences. It will be seen, however, from the documents now submitted, that there is a remarkable measure of agreement on the main issue involved, though naturally there are some loose ends which it will be necessary to tie up when this matter comes to be discussed at Copenhagen.

3. We may start by noting that, while there is not absolute unanimity of view expressed in the annexed documents, there is an overwhelming majority of opinion in favour of amending the *Règles* in such a way as to deny availability to names—both generic names and trivial names—when published in synonymies, whether generic synonymies or specific synonymies, without any independent diagnosis or other " indication " being given for the taxonomic unit (whether genus or species), the name of which was so synonymised. Further, there is a strongly expressed sentiment in favour of introducing safeguards designed to prevent the upsetting of names published in synonymies in cases where such names are well-established as the result of the application by workers of the principle enunciated in the Commission's *Opinion* 78 (1924, *Smithson. misc. Coll.* 73 (No. 2): 1–14), which is inconsistent with the general view now expressed as to the treatment which it is desirable should be accorded to names published in synonymies.

4. In considering proposals for securing the end now sought, it will be necessary to take account of the action taken in Paris in 1948 in relation to the status of manuscript names—or " *nomina nuda* "—published in synonymies. Different aspects of this question were so considered on the following three occasions :—

(1) Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 18 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 145–146) :

The decision in *Opinion* 4 (as then interpreted) was at this point incorporated into the *Règles* as follows :—

> " A manuscript name acquires status in zoological nomenclature only when it is validly published and, on being so published, is published in conditions which satisfy the requirements of the provisos to Article 25, and the status of a manuscript name, so published, is not affected by the question whether the author by whom it is published accepts it as an available name or sinks it as a synonym."

(2) Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 36 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 350–351) :

It was here ruled that a generic name published in a specific synonymy acquires no status thereby in zoological nomenclature.

(3) Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 37 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 351–352) :

The subject here dealt with was the status of generic names published in generic synonymies. No explicit ruling was given on the question of the availability of a generic name published in this way, but it was clearly assumed that such a name was available, for it was here that it was decided that an investigation should be undertaken regarding the species to be accepted as the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which was published in this way.

5. Of the foregoing rulings it is the first which is called into question by Dr. Mayr's proposal, for the second is fully in line with that proposal, while (as explained above) no ruling was taken as regards the third, and any amendment now taken in regard to the first would cover also the third. It will probably be agreed that at this stage no practical advantage would be served by further discussion as to the meaning originally attaching to *Opinion* 4, for that *Opinion* has now been revoked (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 165–166) and the decision in it, as interpreted in 1948, has been incorporated into the *Règles*. The practical issue now to be considered is whether, and, if so, how, the Paris decision is to be amended.

6. Of the main proposals embodied in the documents submitted each has as its object the inclusion in the *Règles* of a provision that no name acquires status in zoological nomenclature by virtue merely of being published in the synonymy of some other name. It is part of these proposals that the *Règles* should make it clear that the foregoing ruling does not apply where a name is published in a synonymy but at the same time is accompanied by a description or other " indication " expressly written for the taxonomic unit to which that name is applied, as contrasted with the taxonomic unit with the name of which it is synonymised.

7. The two proposals referred to above are : (a) the proposals submitted by Dr. Ernst Mayr in Document 33/8 ; (b) the proposals submitted by Professor Chester Bradley in Document 33/26. In dealing with a complicated issue such as the present, it is often convenient for purposes of discussion to have before one the draft of a decision in a given sense, for such a draft serves to crystallise discussion and to ensure also that all the relevant facets of the problem are taken into account. With this object in view I prepared early in 1952 a document reviewing the comments so far received in regard to the present case, to which I attached drafts of two possible conclusions, one approving the proposals submitted by Dr. Mayr, the other rejecting them. This document I sent to Dr. Mayr (under cover of a letter dated 25th January, 1952) for comment and observations. Dr. Mayr, in replying (on 11th February, 1952) suggested certain modifications in the text of the document but none as regards the drafts of the suggested conclusions. In view of the large amount of additional support for the general point of view advocated by Dr. Mayr, I later decided that the paper in question needed to be completely recast and it is for this reason that I have prepared the present note. In view of the great weight of support since received in favour of providing that *nomina nuda* published in synonymies shall acquire no status in zoological nomenclature in virtue of being so published, I no longer consider it necessary to consider the form which it would be desirable to give to a decision rejecting the foregoing proposal, but I still think that it would be helpful to examine the form which a favourable decision should take. I accordingly attach to the present note the draft conclusion which I prepared in consultation with Dr. Mayr. The proposal on this subject by Professor Chester Bradley was not received until long after the draft conclusion referred to above had been prepared. So far as I can see, however, all the points included in it are covered also by the draft conclusion.

8. In the documents now submitted numerous correspondents, including the two applicants referred to above, stress the importance of providing adequate safeguards to ensure that, through the use by the Commission of its plenary powers, well-established nomenclatorial usage is not disturbed in individual cases by the reversal of the Paris interpretation of *Opinion* 4. From the material supplied, it appears probable that the need for remedial action of this kind is most likely to arise in the case of names in the Mollusca. See in this connection the documents received from Professor Harold E. Vokes (Document 33/9) and from Dr. A. Myra Keen and Professor Siemon W. Muller (Document 33/23).

9. In accordance with the principle advocated by the workers referred to in the immediately preceding paragraph, it would follow that normally continuity of nomenclatorial practice would be promoted, in the case of names which have been dealt with in *Opinions*, by validating the decisions so taken, where these were not in harmony with the revised ruling. In one such case, however, namely that dealt with in *Opinion* 78 (Rocky Mountain Wood Tick), it is possible that what is required is not an automatic confirmation of the decision taken in that *Opinion*, but a complete review of the whole problem in the light of the current practice of interested specialists. It will be remembered that this particular *Opinion* has been subject to considerable criticism and that at Paris in 1948 it was specifically excluded from the decision that rulings on individual names in previously rendered *Opinions* should be codified in schedules annexed to the *Règles*, it being decided instead that the decision taken in that *Opinion* should be reviewed by the Commission as soon as possible (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 338). In preparation for the review so decided upon I had a considerable amount of correspondence in the period 1948–1950 with interested specialists but eventually I came to the conclusion that it would be best to put this investigation (Commission's reference Z.N.(S.) 260) on one side until after the general problem raised by *Opinions* 4 and 78 had been settled by the Copenhagen Congress.

ANNEXE TO DOCUMENT 33/1

Draft of a Conclusion which it is suggested would be appropriate if it were decided by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to recommend the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953, to amend the XX " Règles " to provide that the publication of a " nomen nudum " in a synonymy is to be held not to confer any status in zoological nomenclature upon the name so published

It is suggested that approval of the proposals submitted by Dr. Ernst Mayr (Document 33/8) and by Professor J. Chester Bradley (Document 33/25) could appropriately be secured if the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature were to recommend the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology :—

(1) to repeal the decision relating to the incorporation into the *Règles* of the substance of the ruling on the status of names published in synonymies given in the Commission's *Opinion* 4, taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, when it approved the recommendation submitted by the Commission as Conclusion 18 of the Sixth Meeting held during its Paris Session (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 145–146) ;

(2) so far as concerns specific trivial names, to substitute for the provision proposed, under (1) above, to be repealed, provisions prescribing :—

(a) (i) that the use in manuscript of a trivial name for a given species or the publication of a given trivial name as a *nomen nudum* for a species which can be recognised from manuscript sources shall not preclude any author from publishing the trivial name concerned (in combination with the same generic name as that used in manuscript or when the name was earlier published as a *nomen nudum*) either (1) for the species to which it had earlier been applied either in manuscript or as a published *nomen nudum*, or (2) for any other species ;

(ii) that, provided that, when so published, such a trivial name is accompanied by an indication, definition or description, that trivial name shall thereby acquire availability as a name for the species to which the indication, definition or description is applicable ;

(iii) that, save in the special case specified in (b) below, a trivial name of the class specified in (i) above shall, on being published in the conditions there specified, rank for priority as from the date on which it is so published and shall be attributed to the author by whom it is published as aforesaid ;

(b) that, where an author publishes a trivial name which had previously existed only as a manuscript name or as a published *nomen nudum* and at the same time quotes, from manuscript sources, an indication, definition or description of the species in question prepared by the earlier author by whom the name had been used in manuscript, the trivial name in question shall acquire availability in virtue of the publication of the indication, definition or description so published, irrespective of whether the later author by whom the trivial name and the relevant extract from the earlier author's manuscript is published accepts or rejects the name which he so publishes ;

(c) that, subject to (d) below, the publication, without an indication, definition or description, either in a synonymy given for, or otherwise in connection with, a previously established nominal species, of a trivial name which previously had existed only as a manuscript name or as a published *nomen nudum* shall confer no availability upon the name so published and therefore that a name so published shall retain its previous status of a legal non-entity as a manuscript name or, as the case may be, as a published *nomen nudum ;*

(d) that where prior to the date of the coming into operation of (b) above, a trivial name which under that provision is to be rejected as being unavailable had been treated by specialists in the group concerned as an available name, it shall be open to such specialists to make application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for a direction that the trivial name in question be accepted as an available name and it shall then become the duty of the said Commission to direct whether or not the name in question is to be accepted, provided that in every such case public notice of the receipt of the application shall be given by the Commission in like manner as that prescribed for applications involving the possible use of the Commission's plenary powers and that a period of not less than twelve months shall have elapsed from the date of the giving of public notice before a decision is taken by the Commission on the application in question ;

(3) that the provisions specified in (2) above in relation to specific trivial names shall apply also :—

(a) to any generic name published in the synonymy of the name of some other genus ; and

(b) to any generic name published in combination with a specific trivial name where, on the occasion of the publication of that generic name, the specific name comprising it is cited only in the synonymy of the name of some other nominal species ;

(4) to direct that nothing in any *Opinion* rendered by the Commission prior to July, 1948 is to be taken as containing any interpretation of the provisions in regard to the matters aforesaid then inserted in the *Règles* and as subsequently amended.

DOCUMENT 33/2

By **J. E. COLLIN** (*Newmarket, England*)

Letter dated 16th November, 1950

REFERENCE : Z.N.(S.)372

Thanks for your letter of the 29th October, but you realise of course that it is not an answer to the question whether the principle embodied in *Opinion* 4 is contrary to the fundamental laws of Zoological Nomenclature which form the basis of Article 25 of the Rules, and also a contradiction of *Opinion* 1.

I give you credit for not being deceived by the sophistic nature of *Opinion* 4, which conceals the two facts, (1) that a publication of the recognition of an undescribed museum specimen to which a MS. name has been given does *not* mean the adoption and publication of that name as " that under which a species was first designated " (as required under Article 25), and (2) that a museum specimen is *not* a valid indication recognition of which validates the name given to it, *unless and until* the name *is* so adopted and published.

A point apparently overlooked is that there is nothing peculiar about " MS. names ". Every term selected as a proposed name for a genus or species of animal is a MS. name before being validly brought forward as the name by which that genus or species is to be known. *Opinion* 4 therefore constitutes *an exception* to the ruling of Article 25, which if added in the new Rules must read : " Nevertheless a MS. generic or specific name applied or attached to a museum specimen or specimens can become a valid name, *without* being adopted and validly brought forward as the designation under which a genus or species was first published, upon the publication in a generic or specific synonymy of an identification of the museum specimen or specimens to which such generic or specific name was applied or attached, and the name shall be credited to the author who published the identification, and shall date from the date of such publication ".

Actually of course no " term " *can* become a specific or generic " name " in zoology until validly brought forward as the proposed or adopted designation of an animal or group of animals believed to require such a name, a fact apparently entirely overlooked when *Opinion* 4 was drafted. As a consequence *Opinion* 4 is impossible even as an exception to Article 25.

If *Opinion* 4 contradicts Article 25, and is impossible as an exception, all MS. names supposed to have been validated under that *Opinion* must be considered invalid because they have not been proposed and published as laid down in Article 25. I therefore suggest that your proposed questionnaire should take the form of an enquiry into the proportion of generic and specific names validated under *Opinion* 4 *and now in common use* which would disappear as synonyms if the date of their validation must be changed from when they were first printed in synonymy to when they were first adopted as the designation of a genus or species believed to require a name.

I consider it really important that this matter should be cleared up before the new Rules are published.

I enclose a separate note on what I believe to be the correct conclusion in regard to the selection of a type species for a genus the MS. name for which was published in the synonymy of a validly named genus.

ENCLOSURE TO MR. COLLIN'S LETTER OF 16th NOVEMBER, 1950

On type selection in the case of a MS. generic name published in the synonymy of a validly named genus

It is not surprising that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should have experienced some difficulty in arriving at a decision on the correct selection of a type species for a genus supposed to have been validly founded by the publication of its MS. name in the synonymy of a validly named genus. A similar question of course arises as to the type *specimen* of a species the MS. name of which was published in the synonymy of a validly named species. It is surprising however that no one thought of *looking for the cause* of the difficulty. If this had been done it would have become obvious that the difficulty in each of these cases arises solely from the fact that neither a MS. generic name, or a MS. specific name so published, is one brought forward as the proposed designation of a genus, or of a species, believed to require a name. Actually both are so published as records of the identification of certain museum specimens standing under MS. names in a collection. These names are quoted as *MS. names*, *not* as names to be used as the designation of the museum specimens, or of any other specimens. Hence they remain " quoted MS. names ", without status in nomenclature, and a selection of type is neither necessary nor possible. Of course directly such a MS. generic or specific name *is adopted as the designation of a genus or species* believed to require a name, and republished in accordance with the provisions of Article 25, it *then* becomes a valid name, and the selection of a type a simple matter about which no question can arise.

There is nothing peculiar about " a MS. name ". Every " term " proposed (but not validated) as a zoological " name " is a MS. name until published in accordance with Article 25, *i.e.* as the proposed or adopted name by which a described, defined, or validly indicated genus or species of animal is to be known. The words " that name " in the first paragraph of Article 25 (as well as the words " this name " in the second paragraph) refer to *any* MS. name, including one published in a synonymy, and any one must be that " under which a genus or species was first designated " in order to qualify as a valid name.

DOCUMENT 33/3

By **P. C. SYLVESTER-BRADLEY,** B.Sc. (*University of Sheffield, England*)

Letter dated 16th December, 1950

Editorial Note : The four answers given by Mr. Sylvester Bradley refer to the following four questions asked in the note (published in 1950 in the *Geological Magazine* and in January, 1951, in the *Journal of Paleontology*) in which I appealed to palaeontologists for information regarding current practice in regard to names published in synonymies and for advice on the question whether any change in the *Règles* was needed :—

(1) Do you in your work accept as an available name (that is, as a name possessing rights under the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy) a trivial name originally published in a specific synonymy ?

(2) Do other specialists in your field treat such a trivial name in the same way that you do ?

(3) In what branch of the Animal Kingdom are you a specialist ?

(4) (*To be answered only by those specialists, whose answer to Question No.* (1) *is* "*yes*") : Do you consider that confusion and name-changing would result in your special field if the *Règles* were altered in such a way as to render unavailable a trivial name published in a specific synonymy ?

(5) (*To be answered only by those specialists, whose answer to Question No.* (1) *is* "*no*") : Do you consider that confusion and name-changing would result if the present rule that a trivial name published in a specific synonymy, thereby acquires availability, were to be strictly applied to specific names in your special field ?

. . . .

YOUR ENQUIRY IN THE " GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE "

1. Yes, I would do so.
2. I don't know. So far as I know the question has never arisen.
3. Recent and fossil ostracoda.
4. No.

DOCUMENT 33/4

By **W. J. ARKELL,** M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.
(*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge*)

Letter dated 16th December, 1950

Editorial Note : For the text of the questions answered by Dr. Arkell in the following letter, see the Editorial Note to Document 33/3.

ARTICLE 25. YOUR LETTER IN THE " GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE ", p. 442

I can only recall one case of this sort in my field, fossil ammonites.

In their *Pal. Soc.* monograph, 1851–3, on the Mollusca of the Great Oolite, Morris and Lycett described and figured an ammonite as *Ammonites braikenridgii* Sowerby. In the synonymy they put *Ammonites triptolemus* Bean MS., which they found on a museum label. When revising the nomenclature of Morris and Lycett's monograph with L. R. Cox (Cox & Arkell, 1950, Survey of the Mollusca of the British Great Oolite Series, Palaeontographical Soc., part 2, p. 97), I adopted the name *Stephanocera triptolemus* (Morris & Lycett) as the valid name of the species. But it was and is also the only available name, so there is no question of passing over a later name.

For what they are worth, my replies to your questions are :—

1. Yes.

2. Don't know, but should imagine so. Cox did not demur.

3. Fossil cephalopods, and to a lesser extent other mollusca.

4. Yes. I consider that any special cases of " hardship " should be brought before the Commission for suspension if necessary. Case where a new name would be required given above.

DOCUMENT 33/5

By **JOHN T. ZIMMER**
(*American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

Letter dated 30th January, 1951

Dr. Ernst Mayr has shown us his proposals for the elimination by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of the provisions of *Opinion* 4 and *Opinion* 78 whereby *nomina nuda* cited in synonymy are thereby validated as of that date as exact synonyms of the names under which they are cited, regardless of their possible origin in distinguishable material that may later be properly diagnosed or regardless of erroneous identification of any other sort.

While I may disagree with one or two of the points used by Dr. Mayr in his exposition of the case, I would say that I am in accord with his main thesis and join with him in the belief that *nomina nuda* cited in synonymy and not accepted by the author so citing them should have no standing at that point in their history but remain *nomina nuda* until such time as they are properly proposed with their own particular diagnosis. Given such diagnosis, the name may be rejected by the publishing author as a synonym of an earlier name, or it may be accepted as distinct, but at least it will have identifying characters supplied.

This should not preclude an author proposing several alternative names at the same time for a single concept, all of which would be available names. I have encountered such conditions rarely, but they are distinct from *nomina nuda* and there should be no confusion.

It might be advisable, as I believe Dr. Mayr suggested, to place certain names, that would be affected by the proposed change, on the *Official List* to avoid further confusion. In any case, you may record my backing of the proposal to invalidate *nomina nuda* cited in synonymy.

DOCUMENT 33/6

By GEORGE S. MYERS

(*Natural History Museum, Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*)

Letter dated 5th February, 1951

From Dr. Ernst Mayr I am in receipt of a mimeographed memorandum, dated " Jan. 1951," entitled " The Status of *Nomina nuda* Listed in Synonymy". This is a revision of a similar memorandum, received some time ago from Dr. Mayr, this revision having been occasioned, he tells me, by comments I made on the original. As Dr. Mayr's document now stands, I am in strong agreement with it.

I wish to point out especially the last paragraph on p. 1 of the memorandum, in which Dr. Mayr refers to *Opinion* 53. If the provision there made in relation to names published by their own authors in synonymy, for the acceptance of such names is not recognised, then confusion will result, for names of this type or origin are widely accepted and current. I refer not only to my case of *Hyla septentrionalis* Dumeril et Bibron, concerning which I send you a reprint of my paper referred to by Dr. Mayr, but also to a much more serious case, the generic name *Eleutherodactylus* Dumeril et Bibron 1841.

The largest genus of American frogs, containing now close to 100 species, was known for a long time as *Hylodes*, a generic name the type of which does not belong to the genus. In 1904, when there were not over 50 species described, Stejneger corrected the application of *Hylodes* and pointed out the availability of *Eleutherodactylus*, and this name has become thoroughly embedded in the literature through usage in almost every paper that has mentioned this largest of all American frog genera.

There are other instances of names now current which were first published by the authors of these names, but in the synonymy, in herpetology and ichthyology, and to disturb them would be most unfortunate.

This matter is also being referred to the Committee on Zoological Nomenclature of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, concerning the recent appointment of which I believe I informed you. The Chairman of this Committee is William I. Follett, J.D., Curator of Fishes, California Academy of Sciences, Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, California.

DOCUMENT 33/7

By **ROUSSEAU H. FLOWER**

(*University of the State of New York, New York State Science Service, New York State Museum, Albany, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

Letter dated 13th February, 1951

Editorial Note : For the text of the questions answered by Dr. Flower in the following letter, see the Editorial Note to Document 33/3.

Concerning Z.N.(S.) 372, I beg to present the following response to your questions :—

1. No. I know of no case in my files where this has been done.

2. Yes.

3. The field is Paleozoic cephalopods, and Nautiloidea, not restricted to the Paleozoic.

5. I feel strongly that the present rule will cause more confusion than it will eliminate.

I have one case which would be affected by this rule, a situation involving some other matters. Its history is briefly as follows :

Phillips in 1841 (Figures and descriptions of the Paleozoic fossils of Cornwall, etc., p. 115) was the first to validate *Cyrtoceras ornatum*, a manuscript species of Goldfuss 1832, which, from previous citations, had no description and is consequently not available as of that author or date.

Phillips based his brief description upon a drawing made by M. De Verneuil (published in the next year), based upon the original specimen in the Goldfuss collection. However, Phillips in 1841 attributed British material to this species *with question* saying, " The condition of the venter does not admit of strict comparison ". He further indicates doubt as to the identity of the British British material by his heading :

Cyrtoceras ornatum (?) pl. 45, fig. 217. The illustrated specimens are of the British material. The matter would be simple, were it not that Phillips adds " In my catalogue it (the British form) was named *C. foliaceum* ".

The entire description is quoted below to avoid confusion :—

> 217. CYRTOCERAS ORNATUM(?), pl. 45, fig. 217.
>
> Syn.—Goldfuss—(name in collection at Bonn).
>
> Character.—General figure incurved, and tapering; surface ornamented by many longitudinal ridges and furrows, crossed by numerous waved elevated striae, and at distant intervals by large prominent rugged annulations ; section (?) ; septa rather deeply concave ; siphuncle near the dorsal line.
>
> It is to M. DeVerneuil that I owe this reference to Goldfuss's name. The drawing which he showed me exhibits a character on the back, for which the specimens I have seen from Devon are not sufficient to allow of strict comparison. In my catalogue it was named *C. foliaceum.*
>
> Locality.—In South Devon : Newton Bushel.

The drawing of Mr. de Verneuil is undoubtedly that which was published a year later (*Geol. Soc. London, Trans.*, 2nd series, vol. 6, pl. 28, fig, 5, 5a, 5b).

D'Orbigny considered the British and German forms distinct and proposed the name *Gyroceras goldfussi* for the German form. (1850, *Prodrom de Paleontologie Systematique*, p. 4.)

This selection is abrogated by the international rules since it implies selection of the British form as a lectotype. The rules clearly state that selection is not permissible from among specimens attributed to the species with doubt.

Whidborne (1889, Monograph of the Devonian fauna of the south of England, *Palaeontographical Society Monograph*, pp. 92, 94) decided that the British and German forms were distinct, that the British one was the same as the species he described as *Gyroceras praeclarum* (1889, *Geol. Mag.*, decade 3, vol. 6, p. 29). This name has since been in general use.

Under the present rule, it would be necessary to restore *Cyrtoceras foliaceum* and regard *Gyroceras praeclarum* as a junior homonym which should be suppressed.

In this case observance of the present rules will require the use of a name which has been proposed only tentatively, based upon a rather poor type, in favour of a name based upon better preserved and more complete material. The situation in regard to specific identification which is brought up is delicate, and would be removed by a reversal of the present ruling or an action by the Commission arbitrarily invalidating *Cyrtoceras foliaceum* Phillips, an action which I would rather not request of this already sadly overworked body.

There is one further perplexity on which I am not clear. The case I have cited involves several other aspects of the rules than the one point on which you requested the views of various workers. To put it simply :

Mr. X in 1900 discusses a species *A. a.* Mr. Y in 1901 discusses the species listing as a synonym his own manuscript species, *A. b.* If species A. a., X, 1900, is preoccupied and A. b., Y, 1901, replaces it automatically, what restrictions apply to the type species ? Should only the material of Mr. Y be available for the selection of a lectotype ? It would seem so.

In my field I do not know of other cases, but I feel that this is is because the availability of such names which appear in print first, and usually, only, as junior synonyms, has not been generally recognised. It may easily cause changes in the names at present in general use, not a few of which are type species of large and widely-known genera, which will make the confusion greater.

DOCUMENT 33/8

By **ERNST MAYR** (*American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 19th February, 1951

Note: *The present document was first communicated informally to the International Commission by Dr. Mayr under cover of a letter dated 20th August,* 1950.

THE STATUS OF " NOMINA NUDA " LISTED IN SYNONYMY

A *nomen nudum* is a scientific name proposed after 1757 in such a manner as not to fulfil the requirements of Article 25 (see also *Opinion* 126). The qualifications of *nomina nuda* were changed 31st December, 1930, with the revision of Article 25c which now requires that descriptions of new species or genera must " differentiate or distinguish the genus or the species from other genera or species."

A *nomen nudum* is without nomenclatorial standing and does not affect the validity of other names. If the same specific or generic name is subsequently validly proposed, this name is not in any way affected by the prior *nomen nudum*. If a valid description for the *nomen nudum* is published at a later date, the name and the authorship date from the moment of publication of the validating subsequent description. As it is often stated, " once a *nomen nudum*, always a *nomen nudum*." A *nomen nudum* never pre-empts the subsequent usage of the same name.

The status of *nomina nuda* (manuscript names) was regulated by *Opinion* 4 (1907): " Manuscript names acquire standing in nomenclature when printed in connection with the provisions of Article 25 and the question of their validity is not influenced by the fact whether such names are accepted or rejected by the author responsible for their publication." There is nothing particularly injurious to the stability of nomenclature in this ruling, although the wisdom of the " rejection " clause of the *Opinion* has often been questioned, and indeed it contradicts all common sense that a scientist should become the author of a name merely by stating (in the proper context) that it is not a valid name.

Opinion 4 has been applied by most taxonomists to names published with the standard provisions of Article 25, namely, an adequate description, an illustration, or a bibliographic reference to a previously published description or illustration. Great confusion has been created by extending the interpretation of the word " indication " in Article 25 in its application to *Opinion* 4 to include the listing of manuscript names in the synonymy of valid names. This principle was officially stated for the first time in the discussion by Stiles in the comments with *Opinion* 78 (published 9th February, 1924) and shall, for short, be referred to in the subsequent discussion as the Stiles Ruling (or interpretation). Contrary to Stiles's own opinion, this interpretation is not the unavoidable consequence of *Opinions* 4 and 53, as we shall presently explain. This seemingly innocuous ruling is a Trojan horse of gigantic dimensions. It not only threatens the stability of nomenclature in the most serious manner, but it also will lead—if consistently applied—to a whole new philosophy of nomenclature. Furthermore, it violates several of the articles of the International Code explicitly or implicitly, as well as several *Opinions*. A detailed discussion of this ruling seems therefore urgently needed.

The Stiles interpretation of *Opinion* 4 is based on the belief that the listing of a name in synonymy is equivalent to a valid indication as demanded by Article 25. It appears that this is contrary to the best accepted practice. " Indication ", as hitherto interpreted, is either the proposal of a new name with a bibliographic reference to a previously published diagnosis or description or the unambiguous proposal of a valid name to replace a previous name which is considered unavailable. The mere expression of an opinion, namely, that a name is a synonym of another name, is not such a proposal in the sense of Article 25. The International Commission has decided three times previously that invalid names do not acquire validity by listing in synonymy

(1) for pre-Linnaean names (*Opinion* 5)

(2) for misspellings

(3) for infrasubspecific names.

In view of this multiple clear-cut precedent it is confusing to make an inconsistent exception for *nomina nuda* (manuscript names).

The ruling also conflicts clearly with two of the articles.

Article 21 states, although in a rather round-about manner, that the author of a name is the person who is responsible for it. If an author records a name specifically as that of another author he certainly thereby renounces clearly the responsibility for this name and it makes no difference whether or not that name has nomenclatorial validity. It would be circular reasoning of the worst sort to use Article 21 to prove that listing in synonymy is an indication in the sense of Article 25.

Reference must be made here to *Opinion* 53. This *Opinion* deals with manuscript names which by their own authors are proposed as alternative names of valid names. In such a case the author assumes responsibility for the nomenclatorial disposition of his own manuscript name. It can therefore be argued, and this has apparently been the majority opinion, that such cases satisfy the provisions of Article 21. This, for instance, has been the interpretation given by Deignan (1948) for *Ixos pyrrhotis* Hodgson and by Myers (1950) for *Hyla septentrionalis* Dumeril and Bibron. The interpretation sometimes leads to complications, but it does not lead to the inevitable confusion created by extending the ruling to validation of manuscript names of other authors.

The Stiles Ruling also violates in all of its important applications the principle embodied in Article 31, namely, that a name " which undoubtedly rests upon an error of identification cannot be retained." This will be shown presently.

It is interesting to note that in *Opinion* 53, which deals specifically with manuscript names in synonymy, a name is definitely shifted from one species (*Syngnathus conspicillatus* Jenyns) to another (*Halicampus grayi* Kaup) because it could be shown that the synonymising of *Halicampus grayi* Kaup with *Syngnathus conspicillatus* Jenyns was based on a misidentification. In other words, it contradicts the interpretation of *Opinion* 78 which insists that a manuscript name becomes automatically an alternative name of any valid name in whose synonymy it is placed.

Much more serious than these explicit or implicit violations of five specific articles or previous rulings is the fact that the ruling constitutes a definite infringement on the domain of taxonomy by nomenclature. It has, up to now, been considered axiomatic that the International Commission cannot rule on matters of zoology. The Stiles interpretation of *Opinion* 4 usurps rights for nomenclature that rightfully belong to taxonomy. The Commission has confused zoological species and nomenclatorial species-names. Its ruling implies that not only the *nomen nudum* has no nomenclatorial existence (a ruling with which all of us agree), but also that not even the species exists on which the manuscript name or *nomen nudum* is based. *This is an error*, based on a misunderstanding of the zoological basis of *nomina nuda*. A manuscript name, even if invalid according to Article 25, has an author and is based *in most cases on a definite, concretely labelled type specimen* (see also *Opinion* 53). Although non-existent nomenclatorially, the identity of the zoological basis of the name is in many cases not at all in doubt. This is true particularly in the many cases in which the author of the manuscript name has subsequently published an adequate diagnosis.

The type of a manuscript name serves as its onomatophore (name bearer) (Simpson, 1940) and for *this* function it is quite immaterial whether or not the name has nomenclatorial validity. It is the axiomatic basis of the entire type method that the onomatophore can never be changed. If a name could be made valid merely by placing it in synonymy, the grave danger could arise of a name being shifted to a new onomatophore. This is a logical impossibility and a zoological error. The danger of this is apparent as soon as it is realised how often names are quoted in the wrong synonymy. If the International Commission could completely destroy the type of the original manuscript name and all manuscript notes about it, no confusion might result. However the type with the type label continues to exist and a valid description with this name may be published sooner or later, leading to obvious confusion and homonymies.

Synonymising a species with another is a *zoological* action based on a *taxonomic* decision. The rules of nomenclature decide only what to do with these names after such a decision has been made. Synonymising is always a subjective action except in the rare cases where several names are based on a single type specimen. As a subjective action it is subject to error and must be reversible. Normally a name can be removed from the synonymy as soon as it is determined that the type does not belong to the same zoological unit as the name with which it was synonymised. The Stiles Ruling on *Opinion* 4, by supplying a second type specimen, attempts to produce an irrevocable synonymy. It cannot be corrected even if it is determined that the original action of synonymising was based on an error. An " indication " (as required by Article 25) must be something objective, permanent, unequivocal, and irreversible. The placing of a name in synonymy is something subjective, often temporary, often arbitrary, and always potentially reversible. It is therefore obvious that the listing of a name in synonymy should not be allowed to qualify as an " indication " as required by Article 25.

The implication of the Stiles interpretation that a manuscript name has no zoological basis has the superficial appearance of legal correctness, but it is contrary to taxonomic principles and to common sense.

A rule which permits the shifting of a name bearer opens the door wide for an endless amount of name changing resulting in much nomenclatorial confusion. That this danger is not imaginary is evident from recent happenings in ornithology. Literally dozens, if not hundreds of well-established bird names are threatened with change. Our present rules of nomenclature were adopted in

1905. It is obvious that taxonomists between 1758 and 1850 did not always obey rules that were to be adopted 50 to 150 years later. For instance, Temminck, Lichtensten, Bonaparte, S. Müller, Hodgson, and many other ornithologists of the first half of the last century labelled new species as such in their collections and published the names as *nomina nuda* in local lists, lists of duplicates, etc. After such an informal and, of course, invalid introduction into the literature, sometimes 10, sometimes 50 years passed until these names were supplied with a description and introduced into the literature in a valid manner. It has been customary in ornithology in accordance with *Opinion* 4 to cite such names from the date (and with the author) of the final valid publication. The earlier publication of these *nomina nuda* was justly ignored. However, many of these names were listed (often very erroneously !) as synonyms of other species between their original invalid and the subsequent valid publication. It has been customary to ignore these misidentifications. If we were to follow the Stiles interpretation of *Opinion* 4 it would mean that a considerable number of familiar animal names will have to be changed. A beginning of this has already been made by some *viri rerum novarum cupidi* ! For instance, Mittleman (1950) wants to place the well-known name of the large Cuban Tree Frog *Hyla septentrionalis* in the synonymy of the Java species *Rana chalconota* Schlegel and replace it by the name *Hyla insulsa* (Cope). However, as Myers (1950) shows, Schlegel's reference of the name *Hyla septentrionalis* was erroneous, and using similar arguments as those given above, Myers rejects the propriety of applying *Opinion* 4.

Alauda dulcivox Hodgson 1844 was a *nomen nudum* when first listed. In 1858 the name was listed by Horsfield and Moore (Cat. Birds Mus. E.I. Co., vol. II, p. 466) in the synonymy of *Alauda arvensis* L. In 1873 the name was introduced for the first time validly into the literature by Brooks (Stray Feathers, vol. 1, p. 484) who supplied a description and the name has since been quoted by most authors as of Brooks 1873, disregarding Hodgson's *nomen nudum* or the erroneous synonymy of Horsfield and Moore. Both Meinertzhagen and Vaurie in their recent revisions of *Alauda arvensis* have accepted the name *dulcivox* as of Brooks 1873 (contrary to *Opinion* 78).

Worse are the cases where manuscript names of subspecies are listed by subsequent authors under the binominal designation of the polytypic species. If the new interpretation of *Opinion* 4 were accepted they would become alternative names for the nominate subspecies. The absurdity of such a procedure is evident.

For instance, when working on his *Oceanic Birds of South America* (in the mid-20s) R. C. Murphy described (in MS.) a new subspecies of *Oceanites oceanicus* as *chilensis* and marked a specimen in the American Museum of Natural History (New York) as a type. Without supplying a description (or mentioning the author) Alexander, 1928, *Birds of the Ocean* (p. 86) lists the subspecies *chilensis* for the islands off the west coast of South America. In 1934 G. M. Mathews quoted Alexander's name and reference, placing it in the synonymy of the nominate race. This would make the name an alternative name for *oceanicus* under the Stiles opinion. The formal description of *chilensis* was published by Murphy in 1936. Nearly every author since including Mathews in a subsequent publication, has accepted the name *chilensis* as dating from 1936 (but see Sheard, 1943, for dissenting opinions). To use the name *chilensis* as a synonym for the Atlantic Ocean subspecies *oceanicus* would be obvious nonsense.

An even more injurious example concerns the name *Eurystomus orientalis calonyx* Sharpe 1890, a name used for more than 50 years for the exceedingly common, widespread, and familiar Dollarbird of eastern Asia. The name had first been proposed (as *calornyx* !) by Hodgson in 1844 (*nomen nudum*) and this *nomen nudum* was cited under the species name *E. orientalis* by Gray 1848. From 1890 to 1942 the name *calonyx* Sharpe has been used in dozens, if not hundreds, of publications. In 1942 the subspecies was renamed *abundus* by Ripley, at the suggestion of J. L. Peters, as being preoccupied by *calornyx* Gray 1848 ! This ill-advised change of the well-established name *calonyx* has fortunately not been accepted by several recent writers, although it would be correct if the Stiles interpretation of *Opinion* 4 were accepted.

These are merely a few examples which could be multiplied many times. They show, however, what is involved. Cases have been recorded in entomology where the same manuscript name has been listed in the synonymy of four different species. According to the Stiles interpretation this name might be an alternative available name for each of the four different species !

There is one other serious objection to this ruling : it places an intolerable burden of bibliographic research on every author who is on the point of proposing a new species. In order to avoid making a homonym he must not only eliminate from usage all prior validly proposed names, but he must also make sure that the combination has never before been used as a *nomen nudum* and been quoted in synonymy. Since *nomina nuda* are listed only by some cataloguers and monographers it means that every single publication of the group back to Linnaeus must be consulted that has ever used synonymies ! Instead of being able to devote his time to biological and taxonomic research, *Opinion* 4 (in its extended interpretation) would henceforth force the taxonomist to waste all his time on bibliographic research. This is a particular burden for the entomologist because, if listing in a synonymy is considered a valid indication in the sense of Article 25, nomenclatorial recognition is at once also given to all the names of infrasubspecific forms which nomenclatorially have been considered up to now equivalent to *nomina nuda*. The inevitable consequence of the new interpretation is that the name of every aberration, seasonal form, polymorphic variety, age stage, and other individual variant, becomes a valid substitute name for the species or subspecies under which it has been quoted. Furthermore, it pre-empts the use of these names for all the future for any other species or subspecies of the genus. I hardly need to describe the nomenclatorial chaos that would be the result of this interpretation.

Conclusion

It is obvious from this discussion that the Stiles interpretation, accepted by the International Commission in *Opinion* 78, to consider the synonymising of a manuscript name as a valid indication in the sense of Article 25 is a serious mistake and should be corrected at once.

(1) It is in conflict, implicitly or explicitly, with the provisions of Articles 21 and 31, as well as with repeated rulings in other cases that an invalid name (*e.g.*, pre-Linnaean name, variety name, etc.) is not validated by being placed in the synonymy of a valid name.

(2) Listing another author's manuscript name in synonymy is not an objective indication and is based on a misconception of the zoological basis of manuscript names and, in fact, constitutes often an attempt to shift this basis (the " onomatophore " of the name).

(3) The ruling places an intolerable burden of bibliographic research on the taxonomist who would henceforth not only have to list all valid names, but also all occasions where a *nomen nudem* has been listed in the synonymy.

(4) Since many of the manuscript names were subsequently validly published but the preliminary quoting in synonymy was erroneous, the new ruling threatens hundreds of well-established names. It is thus a ruling which " clearly results in greater confusion than uniformity ".

The total weight of this conclusion is not seriously lessened even if one or the other of the preceding arguments is held incorrect or inadequate. Even if several of the above points were held inadmissible, the remainder would still carry enough weight to necessitate an immediate revoking of the unfortunate ruling of *Opinion* 78 extending the interpretation of *Opinion* 4.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the International Commission at once repeal the ruling in *Opinion* 78 which interprets the (erroneous or not) listing of manuscript names of other authors in synonymies as a valid indication in the sense of

Article 25. Manuscript names should be added to the category of names (such as pre-Linnaean names) that have no nomenclatorial rights. No exception should be granted to their status, not even quickening in synonymy.

A manuscript name should become valid only if it is published in accordance with Article 21, that is, if it is published by a subsequent author in such a manner as to indicate that the author considers himself responsible for the name. A manuscript name, not having any nomenclatorial status whatsoever, does not pre-empt the subsequent proposal of the same specific or scientific name for a species based either on the same or on a different type specimen.

Some name changes based on the Stiles ruling have been rather generally accepted. Such names should not be affected retroactively. The Commission should decide these cases on the merits of the individual case, keeping in mind the Monaco admonition to avoid any change that " will clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity ".

References

1. Deignan, H. G., 1948, *J. Wash. Acad. Sci.* **38** : 279–281.
2. Mathews, G. M., 1934, *Novit. zool.* **39** : 191.
3. Mittleman, M. B., 1950, *Herpetologica*, **6** : 24–26.
4. Murphy, R. C., 1936, *Oceanic Birds of South America*, **2** : 754.
5. Myers, G. S., 1950, *Copeia*, **1950** : 203–214.
6. Ripley, S. D., 1942, *Proc. biol. Soc, Wash.* **55** : 169–176.
7. Sheard, K., 1943, *Emu* **42** : 177–180 (1943).
8. Simpson, G. G., 1940, *Amer. J. Sci.* **238** : 413–431.

DOCUMENT 33/9

By **HAROLD E. VOKES**

(*The Johns Hopkins University, Department of Geology, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*)

(1) Extract from a letter dated 23rd February, 1951

Fortunately, I am now well on the road to recovery again and am moved to write you to comment on the communication that was published in the *Journal of Paleontology* in the "January" 1951 issue (received in my office just last week).

With regard to the problem of the use of names published in synonymy, I think that the removal of this provision would cause much confusion in the field of molluscan (particularly Pelecypod) studies, both recent and fossil. This confusion would come on the generic level, where many names, originally proposed in synonymy have been later, and for more than one hundred years, in rather general usage.

While I am aware that your correspondent who has raised the question of the status of *Opinion* 4 was concerned with the matter on the specific level (*i.e.*, the validity of trivial names so published), in my opinion the wording of *Opinion* 4 clearly also involves generic names, and the problem must be considered on this level also, and it is here that our nomenclature would be most seriously affected.

I might cite the many manuscript names of the former English malacologist Leach published by various authors over a period of about fifty years of the early part of the past century. Thus Lamarck, in his Anim. sans Vert. mentions a number of Leach MS. names in his synonymies, and several of these have, on the generic level, been subsequently brought into use. Such, for example is the case of the genus *Thyasira* Leach MS., Lamarck, published in synonymy in volume 5, p. 492 of the above work. Today this genus is everywhere recognised as being validly proposed and is the type of the family *Thyasiridae*. For another example, outside of the Lamarck use of these names: the name *Psammophila*, used by many as a subgenus, or "section" of the genus *Lutraria*, family MACTRIDAE, was first published by Brown in 1827 in his "Illustrated Conchology of Great Britain and Ireland" in synonymy in the plate description to plate 12, figure 1 of his work. Leach's manuscript bearing this name was not published until 1852, when J. E. Gray, of the British Museum, edited the work as a posthumous publication. (Incidentally Neave cites these later names as Leach MS., Gray, though most workers consider that Leach should be given full authorship.)

I must admit that I have had neither the time nor, as yet, the energy to attempt to follow through the entire list of pelecypod names to find out just how many would be involved in such a problem. The above, are, however, typical examples of the nature of the problem that would be raised on the generic level, if the suggestion as to the withdrawal of *Opinion* 4 was to be accepted. Offhand, I am not acquainted with many trivial names that would be so effected, perhaps the malacologists at the British Museum, or the local members of the Malacological Society of London could give some information as to the extent that the adoption of Leach MS. names would affect the nomenclature of the British fauna.

(2) Extract from a letter dated 30th July, 1951

(3) In our communications of last Spring concerned with Dr. Mayr's request for a ruling on the status of specific names first published in synonymy (*Opinion* 4) I had made a point of objecting to the ruling out of such names on a broad basis because of the number of names on the generic level that had first appeared in this manner, especially in the mollusca, and particularly as a result of the apparently wide circulation of a manuscript of Leach on the mollusca of the British Isles. This manuscript was not published until 1852, after the death of Leach, but his manuscript names were quoted in synonymy by many authors, including Lamarck as early as 1818 (Syst. anims. Vert.), and received wide acceptance. As I recall I specifically cited the case of *Thyasira* which first appeared in Lamarck as *Thyasira flexuosa* Leach manuscript in the synonymy of *Tellina flexuosa* as it was denominated by Lamarck. Within a very few years the name *Thyasira* was being widely used (with a number of misspellings) and it has continued to be used to this day, being now the type genus of the family THYASIRIDAE, with a geologic record from the Cocene in Japan and the Oligocene in western North America.

At the time of our earlier correspondence I had not noted that this very situation had apparently been considered during the Twelfth Meeting of the Paris session and that, as phrased on **p. 351,** of *Bull. zool. Nomencl*, vol. **4** :

> " THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—
>
> that words should be inserted in Article 25 to make it clear that a generic name is not to be treated as having been published with an indication by virtue only of its having been published as a generic component of a specific name cited in a synonymy given for a nominal species, and accordingly that a generic name so published does not thereby acquire any status in zoological nomenclature ".

This would seem to be conclusive, but it is bound to cause much confusion, or at least uncertainty and inconvenience, for I believe that a list of perhaps twenty Leach names alone, can be drawn up, that will have to be revised, so far as long-accepted status is concerned. In the light of the wording of the statement in the *Bulletin*, I would assume that the use of the name in the synonymy does not serve to pre-occupy the use of that name and that the first subsequent author, who uses the name outside of a synonymy may be assumed to have validly established it. If this later author uses it in association with the species which is currently accepted as the valid type, then little other than inconvenience will have been caused ; if however, the presently accepted type species is not available, it may be necessary to request the use of the plenary powers.

DOCUMENT 33/10

By **CHARLES H. BLAKE**
(*Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Biology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*)

(1) Letter dated 28th February, 1951

Editorial Note : For the text of the questions answered by Professor Blake in the following letter, see the Editorial Note to Document 33/3.

Referring to your communication in the *Journal of Paleontology*, January 1951, No. Z.N.(S.)372, I would like to reply, not so much as a specialist, but as one for whom names are tools rather than property clothed with vested interests. I will, therefore, give you conclusions on most of the numbered paragraphs and then answers to the questions in paragraph 9.

1. In the instance cited in paragraph 2, the Commission should use its plenary powers.

2. I agree to the Conclusion in paragraph 4.

3. In my own experience, this type of case is sufficiently rare so that variations of practice from one group to another may not be statistically significant. Personally, in any event, I regard such synonyms as validly published and available. There may be no clear answer to the issue raised in paragraph 6.

4. I agree to the conclusion in paragraph 7 with the further proviso that clearly the names must remain available for the action of both the Law of Priority and the Law on Homonymy.

5. To the questions in paragraph 9, I would give the following replies :—

   (1) Yes.

   (3) My systematic and nomenclatorial work has been mostly with living Crustacea and living insects.

   (4) Probably not.

6. I am pleased to see, in your communication, emphasis placed on stability as opposed to uniformity.

7. Valid conclusions in this sort of case might become quite different in the future if authors took to publishing needless, manufactured synonyms to cover the possible unavailability of the names they really publish.

(2) Extract from a letter dated 9th April, 1952

It would appear as a consequence of some correspondence recently with Dr. Ernst Mayr that I arrived at a somewhat different conclusion in reading your communication in the *Journal of Paleontology* for January 1951 than you intended. The communication in question speaks of manuscript names. Mayr at least believes that by that nude names were intended. To me at least those are two quite different classes of names. Manuscript names from my point of view are neither nude nor clothed, they in effect have no existence until published and when published they take whatever meaning they have from the circumstances surrounding their publication. Therefore, a manuscript name in my interpretation when published in synonymy is automatically a synonym of the specific name adopted by the publishing author and my answer rested on that premise. It would certainly be rare that an author would cite a manuscript name and then specifically state that it was not synonymous with the species name under discussion. He would be far more likely to make no mention of it at all. On the other hand, nude names which are already published but without description or indication of their meaning an author might either accept as valid synonyms of his own name or reject, since nude names have sometimes been discussed and assigned variously by different subsequent writers. I would, in fact, agree with the essence of Mayr's view that the validity of a nude name as a synonym is something to be determined by the author who cites the name and if he states that it is not a synonym then it would seem improper for any subsequent worker to accept it as a valid synonym on the basis of that author who expressly rejects it. A subsequent worker could, of course, accept it on his own motion but in that case the allocation would date from him and not some prior and rejecting author.

DOCUMENT 33/11

By **BROOKS F. ELLIS**

(*Department of Micropaleontology, The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

Letter dated 14th March, 1951

In the course of preparing sheets for the Catalogue of Foraminifera, which we publish, the question has often arisen whether or not a particular trivial name originally published as a synonym should be considered available. Our policy heretofore has been to treat the name much as we would have treated it if it had not been published as a synonym. For example, many of d'Orbigny's names were *nomina nuda* when originally published in 1826 ; later, between 1900 and 1904, Fornasini republished d'Orbigny's names together with d'Orbigny's previously unpublished illustrations. Fornasini indicated in many cases that a particular name was, in his opinion, a synonym of another name already in use in the literature. Nevertheless, because d'Orbigny's name was published in connection with a figure and a brief description, we have considered each of these names available and have issued Catalogue sheets for them.

A similar situation exists with regard to some of Schellwien's fusuline names. Schellwien died before his Monograph on the Fusulines was published, and the manuscript was issued and edited by Dyhrenfurth and von Staff. They published Schellwien's names in the plate explanations, but suppressed some of them as synonyms of other names in the text.

We have regarded both of these cases, d'Orbigny-Fornasini and Schellwien-Staff, as if they were the work of separate authors. When the dead author's names are made available by publication with a description and/or figure, we have accepted them, and have indicated their suppression as synonyms, as if it were the work of the second author in a separate publication.

In other cases, where the name in question has been published as a subjective synonym, but without accompanying description and/or figure which would characterise it specifically, we have treated the name in synonymy as a *nomen nudum*. This applies particularly well to " *Lituola subglobosa* Sars," published as a *nomen nudum* in lists by Sars ; mentioned, still as a *nomen nudum*, by Brady in a few publications ; and eventually listed by Brady in the Challenger Report (1884) as a subjective synonym of " *Haplophragmium latidorsatum* Bornemann ". There is some discussion in the text concerning the suppression of Sars' name, but nothing which characterises Sars' species. The name is therefore considered to be still a *nomen nudum* in Brady's publication. In 1910, Cushman used Sars' trivial name, crediting it to Sars, in connection with a description and figures (not as a synonym), and we have accepted the name as available as of that date. Severe difficulties would arise if we accepted Sars' name as available on the basis of its supposed synonymy with "*Haplophragmium latidorsatum* Bornemann," for it would then become an *objective* synonym of Bornemann's name, whereas it has turned out, from examination of specimens by several specialists, that Sars' Recent species and Bornemann's fossil one are not even congeneric.

Our policy, therefore, can be stated as follows: We accept as available names which were first published in synonymy (a) if they are published as *objective* synonyms or (b) if they are published as *subjective* synonyms together with some characterising information, such as a description or (before 1931) a figure or a reference to such information elsewhere in the literature. Subjective synonyms without any characterising information are regarded as *nomina nuda*.

The policy of other workers in our field appears from the literature to be similar to ours in general. Both d'Orbigny's and Schellwien's names, for example, are universally accepted on the basis of their publication by Fornasini and von Staff, respectively. Policy with regard to undescribed and unfigured synonyms differs: Many workers, for example, accept "*Lituola subglobosa* Sars" as available by reason of its publication by Brady as a synonym of "*Haplophragmium latidorsatum* Bornemann," although at the same time they use the two trivial names for two different species which are classified in two different genera. This seems to us illogical, since the only basis for accepting Sars' name would be Brady's description and figures of what he considered to be Bornemann's species (according to modern authors, Brady's form included *three* different species).

In answer to your question No. 3, our published work is concerned only with foraminifera, both Recent and fossil.

Question 4: It would cause considerable confusion and name changing if trivial names published in a specific synonymy were to be made unavailable, if such a rule were retroactive. The specific names of d'Orbigny and Schellwien and many others would have to be suppressed. If the rule were to apply only to future names, less confusion would result.

Question 5: If all names published originally in synonymy, including subjective synonyms without any specific characterising information, were to be accepted as available as substitute names for the nominal species, much confusion would result in our field. For example, such a rule would suppress Sars' specific name, cited above, as an objective synonym of Bornemann's fossil species, and force renaming of the Recent species, which is widely referred to in the literature.

In short, we feel that " circumstances alter cases ", but that a rule could be drawn up which would differentiate clearly between subjective synonyms and objective synonyms, the latter class becoming automatically available, the former becoming available only if published in connection with a description or (before 1931) a figure, or a reference to such information in the literature, which applies *specifically* to the name in question.

DOCUMENT 33/12

By **J. MARVIN WELLER**

(*University of Chicago, Department of Geology, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

Letter dated 29th March, 1951

Commenting on your note in the January number of the *Journal of Paleontology* :

I do not answer your questions because I have no examples of this type in mind, but I have questions of my own to raise. These involve the implication as far as type specimens are concerned in this sort of situation.

If (1) an author describes a new species and includes in the synonymy, along with other names that have been wrongly used for mis-identified similar specimens, the manuscript name of another author, and if (2) the new specific name that he introduced is a homonym, and if (3) the manuscript name is accepted as the valid name of this species, what is the type specimen of this species ? Is it the type selected by the publishing author in spite of the fact that the manuscript author probably never saw it ? Or is it the type selected by the manuscript author in spite of the fact that this has never been illustrated or described in print and the publishing author may be wrong in considering the two names to be synonymous ?

Because these questions arise and because either answer appears illogical I think that publication of a manuscript name in synonymy should not validate it.

Distinction might be made between synonymic names of this type and those which have been clearly introduced as substitute names which might be valid if the preferred one proved to be a homonym. For example, I had the bad judgment, after naming a trilobite *Kaskia chesterensis*, to remark that this species (including some of the identical specimens) had been described under the manuscript name of *Phillipsia okawensis* (*Jour. Paleo.* Vol. **10**, p. 461). Uncertain and borderline cases, however, almost certainly will be found, so it seems to me the only safe procedure may be to outlaw all manuscript names introduced in this way.

DOCUMENT 33/13

Views of workers at the

BRITISH MUSEUM (NATURAL HISTORY), LONDON

Letter received on 8th August, 1951
(Communicated by Dr. Fritz van Emden)

(Commission's Reference : Z.N.(S.)372)

Having taken cognisance of Mr. J. E. Collin's " Memorandum " on *Opinion* 4 and MS. names, Dr. E. Mayr's note on " The Status of Nomina Nuda Listed in Synonymy " and your own recent article in *Journal of Paleontology*, vol. 25 (1951) p. 118, the undersigned support strongly any effort at abolishing the ruling according to which all *nomina nuda* listed and published in synonymy are validly published zoological names. We feel that in the great majority of cases such a binding rule would create greater confusion than uniformity, and that therefore as a general rule these names should be considered as still-born, without prejudice to the sanctioning of exceptions by the Commission where such names are found to be in general use, so that in these special cases their rejection would create greater confusion than uniformity.

As far as material answering the questions raised in your own discussion of the subject is readily available, this will be typed out separately and attached to this letter.

T. C. S. Morrison-Scott
H. Oldroyd
Paul Freeman
Fritz van Emden
Elwood C. Zimmerman
H. W. Parker
M. Burton
T. H. C. Taylor
H. Dighton Thomas
L. R. Cox
H. M. Muir-Wood
Guy A. K. Marshall
J. Balfour-Browne
E. B. Britton
R. D. Pope
D. J. Atkinson
Theresa Clay
W. E. Swinton
W. J. Rees
A. K. Totton
E. Trewavas
R. L. Coe
N. Tebble
L. Bairstow
Eroll I. White
J. M. Carvalho
W. E. China
N. C. E. Miller
J. P. Harding
K. P. Oakley
Jacubski
J. C. Battersby
S. Prudhoe
A. K. Clark
G. O. Evans
Cameron D. Ovey
D. W. Tucker

Annexe 1 to Document 33/13

By G. J. KERRICK (*Hym. parasitica*)

I have no experience of any such case, and do not at the present time wish to take a view of the problem.

Annexe 2 to Document 33/13*

By G. E. J. NIXON

(1) No.

(2) Cannot say offhand but hope so.

(3) Hymenoptera : Braconidae and Serphoidea.

(5) Only to a very small extent.

Annexe 3 to Document 33/13*

By R. B. BENSON

(1) I do not know of any case.

(2) Presumably.

(3) Hym.

(5) Scarcely.

---

* For the questions to which the answers are here given see Editorial Note to Document 33/3.

Annexe 4 to Document 33/13

By **LESLIE BAIRSTOW**

Supplementary note in reply to Mr. Hemming's questions

I think that it would be preferable not to consider a trivial name as necessarily becoming more than a *nomen nudum* even though quoted (whether in a formally tabulated specific synonymy or otherwise) as a synonym of an established species. I am not convinced, moreover, that any change of rule would, as Mr. Hemming considers (1951, *Journ. Paleont.*, vol. 25, pp. 119–20), necessarily have to be such as to deny validity even to a name explicitly stated to be published conditionally as a possibly-needed substitute name.

Martin Simpson, 1884, " The Fossils of the Yorkshire Lias," Second Edition, p. 44, after redescribing *Belemnites laevigatus* Simpson (1866, Mackie's Geological and Nat. History Repertory, I, p. 216), added a note " If the above name be inadmissible, it may be called B. complanatus ". *B. laevigatus* Simpson, 1866, is indeed pre-occupied by *B. laevigatus* Sieten, 1831, Petrif. Wurtemberg, p. 28 and pl. XXI, fig. 12. In these circumstances it seems to me proper that Simpson's name *B. complanatus* should be available for consideration even though proposed only conditionally. However, in this instance it makes no difference in practice, for already in 1876 Blake (in Tate and Blake, " The Yorkshire Lias," pp. 318–319) had proposed *Belemnites aspergillum* on a basis apparently including Simpson's material of *B. laevigatus* ; whilst in any event the name *B. complanatus* Simpson, 1884, is itself pre-occupied by *B. complanatus* Raspail, 1829 (Hist. nat. des Belemnites, *Ann. sci. Observ.*, p. 313 (43) and pl. VII, figs. 63 and 64).

DOCUMENT 33/14

By **ERNST MAYR**

(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

Extract from a letter dated 11th February, 1952

COMMENT UPON A POINT RAISED BY PROFESSOR HAROLD E. VOKES IN A LETTER DATED 23rd FEBRUARY, 1951 (SEE DOCUMENT 33/9)

I have once more studied the case of the genera mentioned by Professor Vokes and found that there are actually two situations involved. Only one of the two is comparable with the situation with respect to specific trivial names covered by my application. If we have a generic name under which another generic name (previously unpublished) is mentioned without the mentioning of any species, the situation is precisely that as the one to which I refer in my petition with respect to specific trivial names. However, since a generic name is defined by the included species or, at least, it was so until 1930, one cannot speak of a *nomen nudum* if definite specific names are cited with the generic name quoted in synonymy from a manuscript. I have checked Dr. Vokes' citations and found that he is referring to the second class of generic names. Even here great difficulties would be created by *Opinion* 78. According to *Opinion* 78 such generic names would become automatic synonyms of the genus under which they are listed. Consequently, precisely the opposite of Professor Vokes' wishes would come true. The acceptance of *Opinion* 78 would lead to the rejection of the names which Professor Vokes would like to save, while the proposed rejection of *Opinion* 78 would lead to their saving. It would seem to me that you should make a clear distinction in your presentation between the two kinds of generic names, otherwise there is a risk of confusion arising. Professor Vokes has not been referring to true *nomina nuda*, although the somewhat unfortunate term " manuscript names " includes both groups of names. It was for this very reason that I have chosen the unequivocal name *nomina nuda* in my petition.

DOCUMENT 33/15

By **JOHN BALFOUR-BROWNE**, M.A.

(*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Department of Entomology, London*)

Letter dated 25th March, 1952

GENERIC NAMES PUBLISHED IN SYNONYMIES (REF. Z.N.(S.)387)

I have noticed your request in volume 7 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* for views on this matter and accordingly send you the following :—

(a) It is not the practice (in Coleoptera), to accept as nomenclatorially available a manuscript generic name or a generic name which had previously only existed as a published *nomen nudum.*

I am strongly in favour of a reversal of the Paris decision, *i.e.*, I consider that it should be made clear in the *Règles* that a generic name published in this manner does *not* acquire any standing in Zoological Nomenclature. My view would not be altered by any circumstance ; I have always regretted the Paris decision.

Question (b) does not arise, as I answer (a) in the negative.

DOCUMENT 33/16

By **G. H. E. HOPKINS,** O.B.E., M.A.
(*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts, England*)

Letter dated 30th April, 1952

GENERIC NAMES PUBLISHED IN SYNONYMIES

(COMMISSION'S REFERENCE Z.N.(S.)387)

In *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7 : 115 you ask for replies from specialists to three questions about the availability of manuscript generic names, or generic names previously published as *nomina nuda*, when published as synonyms. In the groups on which I work (Mallophaga and Siphonaptera) I cannot recall any instances of generic names coming within this category (unless an instance in which a manuscript generic name was published as a synonym of *several* valid generic names, in the same book is an example of it), but (as you remark on p. 114) the problem of trivial names similarly published in synonymies is identical in principle. My replies to the questions are, therefore, based solely on the position with regard to trivial names, but I do not at present see any reason for treating the two classes of names differently.

(1) In the groups on which I work (Mallophaga and Siphonaptera) it has never been the practice to regard publication in synonymy of manuscript names or names previously published as *nomina nuda* as conveying on them any status of availability. In our *Check List of the Genera and Species of Mallophaga*, just published, Miss Clay and I attempted to apply the decisions of the Paris Congress, and therefore (very reluctantly) treated all such names as available, but fortunately we found no instances in which this action necessitated acceptance of a name that had been published in synonymy after being a *nomen nudum* or a manuscript name.

(2) I am strongly opposed to such names being accepted as having been validly published.

(3) I am in favour of a reversal of the Paris decision, but as availability of such names would not have any important effect so far as the groups with which I deal are concerned, I would be willing to reconsider this attitude if it should be found that in other groups such a reversal would cause an appreciable amount of name-changing.

DOCUMENT 33/17

By **Th. HALTENORTH** (*Museum, München, Germany*)

Statement, dated 14th May, 1952, communicated by Professor E. M. Hering

IV. **B.1** sollte massgebend sein.

Bezüglich " C " sollte erst der Begriff des Ms. genau festgelegt werden, da es heute viele Vervielfältigungsverfahren gibt, die zwischen Ms und Buchdruck stehen.

Explanatory Note

The foregoing comment was prepared by Dr. Haltenorth in response to an invitation by Professor E. M. Hering who had prepared a synopsis of the problems at issue for consideration by German zoologists. It is to this document, the relevant extract from which is given below, that the number cited by Dr. Haltenorth refer.

. . . .

B. Für die Entscheidung gibt es 3 Möglichkeiten :

1. Man sieht den Namen als Bezeichnung eines *Artengemisches* an, und die Entscheidung trifft nach den " Regeln " der *erste auswählende Autor*.

2. Man könnte annehmen, dass der *gleiche Name zweimal für verschiedene* Arten gegeben sei, und der zweite Name sei ein Homonym zum ersten, müsste also auf Grund der in Paris 1948 festgelegten *Seiten und Zeilenpriorität als Homonym* vorwoerfen werden. Da in der betreffenden Veröffentlichung die Entscheidung darüber nicht immer möglich ist, müsste in gewissen Fällen Entscheidung der INK. angerufen werden können.

3. Der Name könnte, *wenn er auzdrücklich als Ersatztname* angegeben wurde, *nur auf den zu ersetzenden* angewendet werden, wenn auch irrtümlich eine andere Art als identisch mit diesem bestimmt wurde. Es müsste also der Ersatzname ausdrücklich mit dem Zusatz nom. nov. bezw. nom. mut. bezeichnet werden.

DOCUMENT 33/18

By THE COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE CHICAGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM

Extract from a letter dated 15th May, 1952

The Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum proposes modifications of and additions to the Rules of Zoological Nomenclature as below stated. These proposals* are submitted to the International Commission more than one year in advance of the International Zoological Congress at Copenhagen with the request that they be put to a vote at the Section of Nomenclature of said Congress.

Proposal 2

We propose that the citing of a *nomen nudum* in synonymy is not to be considered as a valid *indication* in the sense of Article 25.

Reasons : We subscribe wholeheartedly to the reasons stated by Mayr in his petition to the Commission.ϕ

Karl P. Schmidt

Dr. Fritz Haas

Loren P. Woods

Robert F. Inger

A. L. Rand (mostly reservations about the form of Proposal 3)

Emmet R. Blake

Rupert L. Wenzel

Colin Campbell Sanborn

Clifford H. Pope

D. Dwight Davis

---

* The other proposals submitted in this letter are being published at the appropriate points in the present volume.

ϕ See Document 33/8.

DOCUMENT 33/19

By **J. R. DYMOND**
(*University of Toronto, Department of Zoology, Toronto, Canada*)

Statement received on 27th May, 1952

I am not in favour of the proposal that any status should be granted to manuscript names published in synonymies.

DOCUMENT 33/20

By **ERICH M. HERING**
(*Abteilungsleiter am Zoologischen Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*)

Received on 7th June, 1952

STELLUNGNAHME ZU DEN VOSCHLÄGEN ÜBER DEN NOMENKLATORISCHEN STATUS VON NAMEN, DIE IN SYNONYMIEN-LISTEN VERÖFFENTLICHT WURDEN

Zu den im *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : pt. 4, pp. 109–118 ausgeführten Vorschlägen nimmt der Stab der Zoologen am Zoologischen Museum in Berlin in folgender Weise Stellung :

(1) Die Gülitgkeit von Genus-und Speziesnamen in Synonymien-Listen wird mit 13 von 14 Stimmen *abgelehnt.*

(2) Bei Anerkennung solcher Namen soll typische Art des synonymen Genus die Art sein, die auch typische Art des Genus ist, zu der das Manuskript-Genus als Synonym gestellt wurde.

(3) Die Einführung von Sicherungsklauseln wird in jedem Falle unterstützt.

Annexe to statement furnished by Professor Hering

Views of members of the Scientific Staff of the Zoologische Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, München

Herr Dr. Walter Forster von der Zoologischen Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, München, erklärt im Einvernehmen mit 11 von 12 befragten Mitgliedern des Zoologen-Stabes des Museums München, dass die Vorschläge unterstützt werden, Manuskriptnamen in Synonymien-Listen sollen Gültigkeit erhalten. Zu Punkt 2 und 3 entscheidet der Stab des Museums München in derselben Weise wie der des Museums Berlin.

DOCUMENT 33/21

By **JOSHUA L. BAILY,** Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

Statement received on 24th June, 1952

(REFERENCE : Z.N.(S.)372)

A *nomen nudum* has no standing whatever, since it has no discernible meaning. If it is subsequently published in a synonymy it acquires a meaning and ceases to be a *nomen nudum* but under the present rules does not acquire legal standing. If subsequently it is accepted it acquires legal standing, but in such a case it should be credited to the writer who legalised it and it should date from its legalisation, not from its origination. Any later writer who wishes to use a double authority citation should be allowed to do so, but in such a case the use of the name of the legalising authority should be obligatory, and the use of the name of any other writer permissive only.

DOCUMENT 33/22

Statement of the views of the

SCIENTIFIC STAFF OF THE ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM OF ZOOLOGY AND PALAEONTOLOGY, TORONTO, CANADA

Enclosure to a letter dated 26th June, 1952, from
Dr. F. A. URQUHART, Director

(For the text of the above letter, see Document 1/39)

GENERIC NAMES PUBLISHED IN SYNONYMIES
(COMMISSION'S REFERENCE Z.N.(S.)387)

Not a single member of our curatorial committee has ever been involved in the matter as presented by you in paragraph 10, page 115 of volume 7, part 4.

We are unanimously in favour of the suggestion that it should be made clear in the rules that a generic name published in the manner outlined by you does not thereby acquire any standing in zoological nomenclature.

DOCUMENT 33/23

By **A. MYRA KEEN** and **SIEMON W. MULLER**
(*Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 1st July, 1952

COMMENT ON THE QUESTION OF THE SPECIES TO BE ACCEPTED AS THE TYPE SPECIES OF A NOMINAL GENUS, THE NAME OF WHICH WAS PUBLISHED PRIOR TO 1st JANUARY, 1931, IN THE SYNONYMY OF A GENUS

In response to the query as to present practice in special fields of zoology or paleontology, we cite the well-known name *Thyasira* in Mollusca. This appears in Lamarck's " Histoire Naturelle des Animaux sans Vertèbres, vol. 5, 1818, p. 492, in the catalogue of *Amphidesma*. The last entry in the synonymy of *A. flexuosa* (" Lamarck ") [= *Tellina flexuosa* Montagu, 1803] reads, " *Thyasira flexuosa.* Leach ". Subsequent authors, noting Lamarck's statement that his specimens came from England, sent by Mr. Leach, have attributed the name to Leach or to Lamarck *ex* Leach MS.

This method of proposal is not common in Mollusca but has been accepted without question. We should approve the establishment of an appointed date, such as January, 1931, after which such introduction should be considered invalid.

DOCUMENT 33/24

Statement of the views of the **COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK**

Enclosure to a letter dated 10th July, 1952, from

Dr. JOHN T. ZIMMER, Chairman

(For an extract from the above letter, see Document 1/41)

GENERIC [AND SPECIFIC] NAMES FIRST PUBLISHED IN THE SYNONYMY OF OTHER NAMES Z.N.(S.)387.

The Commission has held that such names are available, but there is a question whether the provision should not be revised to exclude certain kinds of such names. Dr. Mayr has a petition* before the Commission to that effect and this committee supports at least a modified version of it (which modification Dr. Mayr has already suggested). This would exclude names depending solely on their inclusion in the synonymy for recognition. If accompanied by specific indications of identity, even if not accepted by the author, they would be available for the zoological entity concerned and the inclusion in synonymy of the accepted name would be considered as an error of identification. Quoted synonyms without individual identification would be counted as *nomina nuda* without prejudice to later proposal in acceptable manner. These provisions would affect only names published before 1st January, 1931 ; subsequent dates are covered by Article 25, (c).

If this proposal is rejected, the type species of otherwise unidentified generic names first proposed in synonymy are, *ipso facto*, identical with those of the name under which the manuscript names are synonymised. If a different type species is cited along with the name, it will stand as so designated since it serves to identify the supposed synonym as a distinct entity which may or may not prove to be identical with that covered by the accepted name.

A.M.N.H. Committee on Nomenclature.

(Signed) Edwin H. Colbert
John T. Nichols
Ernst Mayr
George H. T. Tate
John T. Zimmer (Chairman)

---

* See Document 33/8.

DOCUMENT 33/25

By **C. W. WRIGHT** (*London*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 18th July, 1952

GENERIC NAMES IN SYNONYMIES (Z.N.(S.)387)

Para. 10.

Question (1). I work in Cephalopods (Ammonoidea). I only know of one generic name first published in a synonymy. That name has been mentioned once subsequently to my knowledge, and as if a valid name.

Question (2). I am emphatically not in favour of the Paris Congress decision.

Question (3). I am in favour of reversing the Paris Congress decision even if it does cause some instability to do so. Individual cases where a generic name was first published in a synonymy which specialists desire to retain should be dealt with by application to the Commission for exercise of plenary powers.

DOCUMENT 33/26

By **J. CHESTER BRADLEY** (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

Statement dated 18th July, 1952

NAMES PUBLISHED IN SYNONYMY

In answer to the questions asked in paragraph 10 (page 115) of the Secretary's paper in vol. 7 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature.* (1) In Hymenoptera and Coleoptera it has not been usual, so far as I am aware, to recognise a manuscript name as having been validated by reason of being published in synonymy of a previously published name. I have no doubt but that in some instances such names have been recognised as a result of *Opinion* 78. (3) I am in favour of a rule to the effect that publication of a manuscript name or republication of any other *nomen nudum* in synonymy does not in itself validate that name. I should not change my view if it were found that in other groups such a rule would cause name-changing. In either case I should provide that a name which had become established as a result of applying the principle enunciated by Secretary Stiles in discussion of the case involved in *Opinion* 78 should be referred to the Commission, and that the Commission should be instructed to decide each such case in the manner least disruptive of usage.

In attempting at Paris to codify the principles of *Opinions*, 4, 53 and 78, certain very important considerations brought out by Dr. Mayr were not perceived. This led us into a theoretically illogical and contradictory position which certainly must be rectified.

As pointed out by Dr. Mayr, citation in synonymy (except by demonstrating that the types are one and the same specimen (or species in case of a genus) is *always subjective*, *always subject to reversal*, and very frequently (from a zoological viewpoint) wholly erroneous.

No author who cites a manuscript name in synonymy has an intention of erecting a new species or genus, objectively synonymous with the one in the synonymy of which he lists it, he has no thought that its types shall be those of the latter instead of the specimens which circulate or exist in some museum under the manuscript name. To force such a conclusion is an absurdity. Hoyle, in dissenting from *Opinion* 53, was perfectly correct: "Kaup never proposed or suggested the formation of a species *Halicampus grayi**. The meaning of his bibliographical reference is that a specimen . . . in the British Museum which had . . . been labelled by him '*Halicampus grayi*' was really, in his opinion, referable to *Syngnathus conspicillatus* Jenyns. Whether he was right or wrong in this opinion does not seem to me to affect the question at issue. He did not create a new species ".

---

* He listed the manuscript name *Halicampus grayi* in synonymy of *Halicampus conspicillatus.*

It should be borne in mind that what is ordinarily referred to as " publishing the synonymy of a species " consists first of an objective bibliographical reference to the original description, followed by a subjective listing of names that in the opinion of the author are *in varying degree* synonymous. One cannot tell at all which of the names he considers to apply to a form that differs in no respect from the type, or which apply to variants, forms, geographical subspecies, etc., all of which in his view constitute a single species. How then could one even infer the degree of synonymy of the specimens that are represented by the manuscript name that he lists ? I have put this question at the specific level, but the same reasoning applies to the genus.

I therefore propose that it be agreed to recommend to the next Zoological Congress :

(1) That in conclusion 18, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 145, the phrase at bottom of p. 145 and top of p. 146 " is published in conditions which satisfy the requirements of the proviso to Article 25 " shall be so modified so as to make it clear that the description or other validating items must be specifically directed to the previously manuscript name or *nomen nudum* which is thereupon being validated, and not merely indirectly by reason of being applied to another name to the synoymy of which the previously manuscript name is being relegated.

(2) That in conclusion 47, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 563, the matter in parentheses (round brackets) forming lines 9, 10 and part of 11 of the last paragraph be stricken out.

(3) That words be inserted in Article 25 expressly stating that in no case shall the mere listing of a manuscript name or of a *nomen nudum* in the synonymy of a genus or of a species confer any status of validity or availability upon the name in question, nor shall it confer upon it any status under the law of homonyny.

(4) That, in view of the prior *Opinion* 78, now cancelled, that a *Recommendation* should be inserted in Article 25 requesting any taxonomist who finds a name in current use by reason of its having been supposed that its citation in synonymy of another name conferred nomenclatorial validity upon it to bring the case to the attention of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

(5) That words be inserted in Article 25 directing the Commission, in any such case to act if necessary under its plenary powers, in order to conserve the most customary usage.

DOCUMENT 33/27

By **HENNING LEMCHE** (*Universitetets Zoologiska Museum, Copenhagen*)

Letter dated 20th July, 1952

Concerning nominal genera published in synonomies, I think that we made an error in Paris. When at the time the whole problem was under discussion, those present had their attention so directly drawn towards the question concerning the type species that they—so to say by a slip—did not realise that the other question, that of the validity of the genus itself, was more than problematic. I am quite sure, at least, that this happened to me. It is probably the reason why no discussion at all arose on that point.

As the new *Règles* have not been published definitely till now, and as it is very difficult to pick out of the bulky Minutes of the Paris Meetings, I think that very few people will have made any corrections in nomenclature according to the decision in question made in Paris, and so, we probably are to reverse our decision immediately in order to prevent the confusion that may else arise.

In my own group, the *Opisthobranchs,* I do feel that so few authors really know about the details of the rules of nomenclature that there is no established "practice" in this minor question. However, I feel certain that much less difficulty is involved if we keep to clear and easily handled rules. It is by far the more easy to say quite generally (as has been done hitherto) : If a name has not been proposed for *use*, it is no real name. Then, we escape all the difficulties you have been asked to study in detail.

As the plenary powers are available in *all* cases where it is advisable, there should be no special reference thereto.

DOCUMENT 33/28

From **E. RAYMOND HALL**

(*University of Kansas, Department of Zoology, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*)

(Enclosure to a letter dated 22nd July, 1952)

Rule as unavailable if unaccompanied by a description.

DOCUMENT 33/29

Views of certain members of the **NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY**

Letter, dated 25th July, 1952, with enclosures, from
Mr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman

GENERIC NAMES FIRST PUBLISHED IN SYNONYMY : Z.N.(S.)387

I enclose herewith copies of comments on this subject, received from members of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology.

Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty, who is also a member of this committee, submitted a paper entitled " The Species to Be Accepted as the Type Species of a Nominal Genus, the name of which was first published in a Generic Synonymy," at the recent symposium conducted by the Pacific Section of the society. Unfortunately I have not available a copy of Dr. Dougherty's paper, but I am informed that he has furnished you with a copy, for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature.**

Enclosure 1 to Mr. Follett's letter of 25th July, 1952

Extract from a letter, dated 20th May, 1952, from **HENRY TOWNES**
(*North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering of the University of North Carolina, Raleigh, North Carolina, U.S.A.*)

(4) Names published only in synonymy were never " proposed " and therefore are not available.

---

* See explanatory note in Document 33/33.

Enclosure 2 to Mr. Follett's letter of 25th July, 1952

Note prepared by Mr. Follett setting out views expressed to him orally by Professor **ROBERT L. USINGER** (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) at Berkeley on 25th June, 1952

(Dr. Usinger is absent in the field, and in order to meet Mr. Hemmings's deadline I am submitting this statement on Dr. Usinger's behalf, and am sending him a carbon copy so that he may supplement it as may seem desirable to him on his return.—W. I. F.)

I am inclined to agree with Dougherty. The two critical points are: (1) a generic name published in a generic synonymy is automatically provided with a definition in accordance with Article 25, and should be available; and (2) the question has to be decided one way or the other.

Enclosure 3 to Mr. Follett's letter of 25th July, 1952

Statement prepared by **Dr. JOHN T. ZIMMER**
(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

387. I favour the exclusion of names, generic and specific, first published in the synonymy of other names without specific identification of their own. Thus, an author may give characters (or references to such) but still refuse to adopt such names, in which case the name would be available. If " identifiable " solely by inclusion in synonymy, it should be considered a *nomen nudum*. This, of course, covers only names published prior to 1931.

If this proposal is rejected, the type species of the synonyms in question must be identical with that of the name under which they are synonymised. If a different type species is cited at the time of this original publication, it identifies the name and removes it from obligatory synonymy, coming under my previous paragraph.

DOCUMENT 33/30

Statement of the views of certain members and former members of the

COMMITTEE ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ICHTHYOLOGISTS AND HERPETOLOGISTS

Letter, dated 26th July, 1952, with enclosures, from
Mr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman

GENERIC NAMES FIRST PUBLISHED IN SYNONYMY: Z.N.(S) 387

The enclosed copies of correspondence reflect the views of members (and former members) of the Committee on Zoological Nomenclature of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, concerning the problem herein above mentioned.

Enclosure 1 to Mr. Follett's letter of 26th July, 1952

Extract from a letter, dated 13th April, 1952, from **CHARLES M. BOGERT**
(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

Second, with reference to the problem of *nomina nuda* . . . It seems sufficiently plain that Stiles' opinion was so completely outlandish and was so manifestly misguided that it should obviously be corrected. However, it would do no harm to have the Committee undertake to express this opinion to the International Commission, taking for granted that it represents the consensus of the Society without a poll. I can see no necessity for revising the enclosed memorandum*, as already modified and improved by Ernst Mayr.

Enclosure 2 to Mr. Follett's letter of 26th July, 1952

Extract from a letter, dated 8th May, 1952, from **ARNOLD B. GROBMAN**
(*University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, U.S.A.*)

I am in substantial agreement with Mayr and Myers regarding the necessity for the International Commission to consider the problem of *nomina nuda* and would be pleased to have Mayr's memorandum considered an expression of my views.

---

* The document by Dr. Ernst Mayr referred to in this and following enclosures to Mr. Follett's letter is assumed to be that submitted to the International Commission and now reproduced as Document 33/8.

Enclosure 3 to Mr. Follett's letter of 26th July, 1952

Extract from a letter dated 23rd April, 1952

from **ROBERT RUSH MILLER,** (*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*)

Regarding Ernst Mayr's memorandum " The Status of *nomina nuda* Listed in Synonymy " I have the following comments to offer :

> I favor the conclusions reached in this memorandum but I believe that the Commission has already acted in like manner (see *Bull. zool. Nomencl,* vol. 4, pp. 148-149 and 345 ; 1950).
>
> ...In the event that I have read the " new Rules " too hastily (hence incorrectly), and action is called for, I would favor support of Dr. Mayr's memorandum in principle as an expression of the consensus of the A.S.I.H.

Enclosure 4 to Mr. Follett's letter of 26th July, 1952

Extract from a letter, dated 16th April, 1951, from **HOBART M. SMITH** (*University of Illinois, Department of Zoology, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

Material relating to the status of *nomina nuda* listed in synonymy have been received and digested. My opinions on the points listed follow.

... As for my personal opinion : some of Mayr's points are good, others not. Some extensively exploited approaches are, so it appears to me, strongly biased and not wholly logical. Especially inacceptable are paragraphs 3 and 4 of page 2. Bells would indeed toll for the stability of taxonomy if any recognition whatsoever were to be given the specimens upon which *nomina nuda* are based because of their role as onomatophores of *nomina nuda*. It would be highly dangerous to give taxonomic recognition as an onomatophore to any specimen not adequately described as well as named.

The discussion does not adequately emphasise the difference between authoring a name and authoring a species. Existing terms make it difficult to avoid ambiguity on my own part. But to proceed : in the normal course of describing a species, a student does two things (with which I am here concerned): he proposes a name, and he describes the (we hope) single onomatophore which bears that name. For recognition of the species to which that name and onomatophore belong, which is more important—the name itself, or the onomatophore (or description thereof, actually, since it, not the specimen itself, is published) ? Clearly the description is the meat, the name but a shell. One can recognise a species by description, not by a name alone. It follows that the author of the description is the " author of the species " or of the scientific name, and if he applies a name no one else has used for a description of a species it should stick. *The author of the words making up the name* is reasonably and actually immaterial. How often have we named something following a suggestion of a colleague ? I have, plenty of times. Some authors have even stated that the name applied was given by someone else. What difference ? The guy who applies it to a description (or indication, etc., etc.) still is, in my opinion, the author of the scientific name of the zoological entity involved.

I do not want to expand this view here. Let someone who knows his way around better than I handle it. I do hope to have made clear, however, that something can be said on the other side. Certainly recognition of *nomina nuda* cited in synonymy introduces problems ; I think the problems are far more serious if one does not so recognise them, or at least if one does not adhere to the *principles* back of such recognition. Presumably an acceptable compromise could and should be reached. In any case use, perhaps generous use, of the plenary powers of the Commission probably will be needed.

DOCUMENT 33/31

By **W. E. CHINA,** M.A., D.Sc.
(*British Museum (Natural History), Department of Entomology, London*)

Extract from a letter dated 20th August, 1952

GENERIC NAMES PUBLISHED IN SYNONYMY (REF. Z.N.(S.)387)

My answer to Paragraph 10 on page 115 of your paper in vol. 7 of the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* is " No ".

I agree with Mayr that such a nominal genus is a *nomen nudum*. So far, I have not come across a similar case in the Hemiptera.

DOCUMENT 33/32

By **K. H. L. KEY** (*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Division of Entomology, Canberra, Australia*)

Extract from a letter dated 4th September, 1952

(**Note :** The main portion of the above letter was concerned with the problem of the emendation of names, on which a separate paper was submitted by Dr. Key and which constitutes Document 5/26 of the Copenhagen Series.)

I have studied your proposals in connection with the other six questions referred to you by the Thirteenth Congress, and in general I find myself in hearty agreement with them.

DOCUMENT 33/33

By **ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY**, Ph.D., M.D.

(*Department of Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*)

Editorial Note : Attention is drawn to a paper entitled " Problems of Nomenclatorial Practice now under consideration by the International Commission : Secretary Francis Hemming's Fourth and Fifth Problems " which has been included in the Copenhagen Series, as Document 6/19 of the present volume. In the foregoing paper Dr. Dougherty concludes as follows : " In conclusion, therefore, it is my feeling that a simple and desirable solution of the problem of determining type species for nominal genera first published in generic synonymies would be to construe them as falling under the provisions of Article 30, Rule (f), as clarified and restricted by Secretary Hemming and by me ". (Intl'd) F. H.

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

CONTENTS

(continued from front wrapper)

ARTICLE 25: STATUS TO BE ACCORDED TO GENERIC NAMES AND TRIVIAL NAMES PUBLISHED AS "NOMINA NUDA" IN SYNONYMIES (COPENHAGEN CASE NO. 33)

Sources of documents published in the present Part

Page
D.33/1 FRANCIS HEMMING (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 299
D.33/2 J. E. COLLIN (*Newmarket, England*) 306
D.33/3 P. C. SYLVESTER-BRADLEY (*Sheffield*) 309
D.33/4 W. J. ARKELL (*Cambridge*) 310
D.33/5 JOHN T. ZIMMER (*New York*) 311
D.33/6 GEORGE S. MYERS (*Stanford, California, U.S.A.*) .. 312
D.33/7 ROUSSEAU H. FLOWER (*Albany, N.Y., U.S.A.*) .. 313
D.33/8 ERNST MAYR (*New York*) 315
D.33/9 HAROLD E. VOKES (*Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) .. 323
D.33/10 CHARLES H. BLAKE (*Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*) .. 326
D.33/11 BROOKS F. ELLIS (*New York*) 328
D.33/12 J. MARVIN WELLER (*Chicago*) 330
D.33/13 BRITISH MUSEUM (NATURAL HISTORY), LONDON 331
D.33/14 ERNST MAYR (*New York*) 334
D.33/15 JOHN BALFOUR-BROWNE (*London*) 335
D.33/16 G. H. E. HOPKINS (*Tring, England*) 336
D.33/17 Th. HALTENORTH (*München*) 337
D.33/18 CHICAGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM (Committee on Nomenclature) 338
D.33/19 J. R. DYMOND (*Toronto, Canada*) 339
D.33/20 ERICH M. HERING (*Berlin*) 339
D.33/21 JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) 340
D.33/22 ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM OF ZOOLOGY AND PALAEONTOLOGY, TORONTO 341
D.33/23 A. MYRA KEEN & SIEMON MULLER (*Stanford, California, U.S.A.*) 342
D.33/24 AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK (Committee on Nomenclature) .. 343
D.33/25 C. W. WRIGHT (*London*) 344
D.33/26 J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) .. 345
D.33/27 HENNING LEMCHE (*Copenhagen*) 347
D.33/28 E. RAYMOND HALL (*Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) .. 347
D.33/29 SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY (Nomenclature Committee) 348
D.33/30 AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ICHTHYOLOGISTS AND HERPETOLOGISTS (Committee on Zoological Nomenclature) 350
D.33/31 W. E. CHINA (*London*) 353
D.33/32 K. H. L. KEY (*Canberra, Australia*) 353
D.33/33 ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY (*Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) 354

Triple-Part 3/5 (Emendation of names)

It is regretted that technical reproduction difficulties are still holding up the publication of this Triple-Part. Publication is expected shortly after the present Part.

Printed in England by Metcalfe & Cooper Limited, 10-24 Scrutton St., London E C 2

VOLUME 10. Part 12
Pp. 355—390.

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

23rd July, 1953

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of
THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by
FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Copenhagen Discussions : Cases 34–38 Proposals relating to Article 25 (Cases 34–37) and Article 28 (Case 38)

LONDON:
Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1953

Price Fourteen Shillings

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)
Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming
Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Part 12 (pp. 355–390) 23rd July, 1953

CASE No. 34

ARTICLE 25 : PROPOSED INSERTION OF A PROVISION THAT A TRIVIAL NAME CONSISTING OF SPELLED-OUT LETTERS OR NUMERALS SHALL NOT BE ACCEPTED AS AVAILABLE WHEN THOSE LETTERS OR NUMERALS WERE ORIGINALLY EMPLOYED AS ORDINALS FOR THE ENUMERATION OF THE SPECIES, SUBSPECIES OR INFRA-SUBSPECIFIC NAMES CONCERNED

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)371)

DOCUMENT 34/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

ON MR. G. H. E. HOPKINS' PROPOSAL RELATING TO TRIVIAL NAMES CONSISTING OF SPELLED-OUT LETTERS AND NUMERALS

Attention is drawn to the proposal submitted by Mr. G. H. E. Hopkins (*British Museum (Natural History), The Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts.*) on the subject of the status of trivial names consisting of spelled-out letters or numerals in cases where those letters or numerals were originally employed for the enumeration of the species, subspecies or infra-subspecific forms concerned in lists in catalogues or the like.

2. Mr. Hopkins' application was published in September, 1951 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 52-53), and it is accordingly necessary here to refer to it only in sufficient detail to enable a decision to be taken on it. The point is this : Serial letters were rejected as trivial names in the Commission's *Opinion* 64 and this decision was confirmed in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 140). But this decision does not cover the further case, on which a decision is now asked where :—

(1) An author "A" gives descriptions for a number of races or forms but does not give names to them, contenting himself with applying to them either serial letters (" a ", " b ", etc.) or serial numbers.

(2) A later author makes the mistake of supposing that the serial letters used by author "A" were intended by him to be names ; in order to get round the difficulty that an individual letter is not eligible to be a trivial name, the later author then spells out the letter, thereby creating a word which he treats as having been published by author "A" as a name.

3. Mr. Hopkins gives an example where an author (Piaget) described a number of forms for a given species and applied to these forms, which he did not name, serial letters in the Greek alphabet, and a later author (Kellogg) spelled out these letters—as " alpha ", etc.—and treated them as names given by the earlier author. Mr. Hopkins adds that the names so given by Kellogg have been ignored by most authors, but that recently one author has started to use them. It is for this reason that Mr. Hopkins asks for an immediate decision.

4. The suggestion made by Mr. Hopkins is that a provision should be added to the *Règles* that letters and numerals are ineligible for use as trivial names and that this applies equally where letters or numerals were originally applied to the taxonomic unit concerned as ordinals and where some later author spells out those letters or transliterates those figures.

5. A solution on the lines recommended by Mr. Hopkins would certainly meet the difficulty he has raised. It seems to me, however, that it would be going too far to place an absolute ban upon the use of such words as " alpha ", " delta " or " quatuor " as trivial names (however inappropriate they may be) if they were deliberately published as such, for names so published stand in a different position from that of the same names—as it were—accidentally published, as were names of this kind by Kellogg in the example cited by Mr. Hopkins. If this view were to be taken, it might be considered that the needs of the case would be sufficiently met if a provision were to be inserted in Article 25 prescribing that, where an author spells out a letter or transliterates a numeral applied by a former author as an ordinal to an unnamed species, race or form and attributes that name to the author by whom the letter or numeral had been used as an ordinal and not as a name, the name, as published by the later author, shall have no status of availability. Under such a ruling, the word " alpha " (to take an example) would not constitute an available trivial name when (as in the case cited by Mr. Hopkins) it was published, as it were, accidentally and without an intention to publish a new name on the part of the author who first published the word " alpha " as a name, i.e., where the author concerned had no " animus nominandi " (see Document 32/1). On the other hand, the word " alpha " would be acceptable as a trivial name, if deliberately published as such by any later author.

CASE No. 35

ARTICLE 25 : PROPOSED INSERTION OF A PROVISION DENYING THE STATUS OF AVAILABILITY TO A TRIVIAL NAME INADVERTENTLY PUBLISHED AS THE RESULT OF THE MISREADING OF A PREVIOUS PUBLICATION OR OF A MUSEUM LABEL OR THE LIKE

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)577)

DOCUMENT 35/1

By the late **JAMES L. PETERS** (*Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*)

Letter dated 11th June, 1951

Mr. H. G. Deignan, of the United States National Museum, has called to my attention a singular case which I believe should be submitted to the International Commission for an *Opinion*.

The facts, supplied by Mr. Deignan, are as follows. In 1869 the United States National Museum acquired a collection of birds including a specimen of Horned Lark (*Eremophila alpestris* (Linn.)) from the dealer Wilhelm Schlüter of Halle an der Saale. This bird bears an original label with the words " Alauda alpestris/var : bei Astrakan ". From the file of correspondence with Schlüter it is clear that Astrakan represents the province of that name in south-eastern Russia.

Ridgway, in Baird, Brewer and Ridgway, *History of North American Birds*, Land Birds, vol. 2 [Feb. 1874], p. 141, writes under the account of *Eremophila alpestris* " . . . there is also a fine specimen from Astrachan representing a white-throated race (' var *bei* on MS. label ') ", and the name " bei " is again mentioned on page 142 in connection with a comparison with E.*a. occidentalis*. A further complication is that the name *bei* antedates *Otocorys brandti* Dresser, *History Birds of Europe*, pt. 32, Dec. 1874, a name applicable to the same race of Horned Lark, and one that has been in continuous use since its introduction.

Of course no confusion would ensue were *bei* to replace *brandti*—merely a little temporary inconvenience and the usual resentment. The crux of the matter in my mind is the nature of the name. The German word " bei " is a preposition meaning about ; at ; near, etc., and prepositions are not acceptable as trivial names under the Rules (Articles 14, 15 and 16, *Opinion* 64). It may be argued that Ridgway (who was in his early twenties at the time) was unaware of the meaning of the word " bei " and imagined it to be a manuscript name, noun or adjective, in a European tongue. It may also be argued that " bei " can be taken as an arbitrary combination of letters or " barbarous " word and as such would be available under the rules.

On the other hand, suppose some German author with a specimen of an American bird from near Washington had named it " near ".

My feeling in the matter is that the name " *bei* " be set aside as not being acceptable as a trivial name under the Rules, and that the Commission make clear that this, and only this, is the reason for its action. To set " bei " aside under suspension of the rules would not accomplish any useful purpose.

DOCUMENT 35/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

PROPOSED DENIAL OF AVAILABILITY FOR TRIVIAL NAMES INADVERTENTLY PUBLISHED THROUGH THE MISREADING OF A WORD WRITTEN ON A LABEL OR USED IN A BOOK

In his letter of 11th June, 1951 (see Document 35/1) the late Dr. James L. Peters drew attention to a case where an American ornithologist misread a label bearing the legend " Alauda alpestris/var : bei Astrakan " on a specimen of the Horned Lark obtained by the U.S. National Museum from the German dealer Schlüter, mistakenly supposing that the German preposition " bei " was a manuscript trivial name applied (by Schlüter or some other German ornithologist). Dr. Peters further pointed out that the foregoing mistake was made public in a paper published in February, 1874, and therefore that, if the word " bei " were accepted as having been validly (though inadvertently) published by Ridgway on the above date, the oldest available name for this white-throated subspecies of *Eremophila alpestris* (Linnaeus) would be *bei*, that subspecies not having been deliberately named until December, 1874, when Dresser gave it the trivial name *brandti*.

2. Dr. Peters pointed out that no confusion would arise if the trivial name of this bird were to be changed from *brandti*, the name by which (he explained) it has been continuously known since 1874, to the name *bei*, and he therefore did not favour the use by the Commission of its plenary powers to protect the name *brandti* as against the alleged name *bei*. He felt however, that a word of the kind represented by the word " bei " ought not to be accepted as having been validly published under the *Règles*. Dr. Peters pointed out also that a name of this kind would be particularly objectionable to workers belonging to the country from whose national language the misconceived trivial name was drawn. What, he asked, would American ornithologists think if a German author, making a mistake similar to that made by Ridgway in 1874, was to give the trivial name " near " to an American bird taken " near " Washington ? He might well have added that, if availability, as a trivial name, were to be granted to a German preposition (such as " bei ") inadvertently published as such a name, there would be nothing to prevent the appearance, as trivial names, of other German prepositions such as " am ", French prepositions such as " près ", " sur ", etc., and English prepositions such as " at ", " on ", " in ", etc. Clearly, names of this sort would be a reproach to zoological nomenclature.

3. **Recommendation submitted :** Dr. Peters' suggestion was that alleged names of this kind should be ruled as unavailable by the International Commission under an interpretative " Declaration ". Such a " Declaration " would, however, need to be brought before the next International Congress of Zoology, and, as a Congress is to meet at Copenhagen in 1953, it seems to me that the best course would be to put this matter before the Commission at its Session during the Congress, so that it may make to the Congress whatever proposal it considers the most appropriate. The proposal which, following the line suggested by Dr. Peters, I should like to submit for consideration is that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision " that, where, by reason of misreading a book or paper or of a museum label or the like, an author erroneously concludes that a given word employed by the previous author had been intended by him to be the trivial name for the taxonomic unit concerned and himself adopts that word to be the trivial name for that taxonomic unit, the name so published shall possess no availability under the Law of Priority ".

CASE No. 36

ARTICLE 25 : PROPOSED INSERTION OF A PROVISION THAT CERTAIN CLASSES OF GENERIC NAMES PUBLISHED FOR FOSSIL SPECIES AND BEARING THE TERMINATION " -ITES ", " -YTES ", OR " -ITHES " POSSESS NO STATUS IN ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)415 and 447)

DOCUMENT 36/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

PROPOSALS FOR THE CO-ORDINATION OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY DR. L. R. COX FOR THE REJECTION OF CERTAIN CLASSES OF GENERIC NAMES PUBLISHED FOR FOSSIL SPECIES AND BEARING THE TERMINATION " -ITES ", " YTES " OR " -ITHES " WITH A PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY PROFESSOR J. WANNER FOR THE AUTOMATIC EMENDATION FROM " -CRINITES " TO " -CRINUS " OF THE TERMINATIONS OF GENERIC NAMES PUBLISHED FOR SPECIES OF PELMATOZOA

The object of the present note is to draw attention to the overlap between a proposal (Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)447) submitted by Professor J. Wanner (*Scheidegg/Allgäu, Bavaria, Germany*) for the automatic emendation from " -crinites " to " -crinus " of the terminations of certain generic names published for species of Pelmatozoa with a slightly earlier proposal for the rejection of certain classes of generic names published for fossil species and bearing the terminations " -ites ", " -ytes " or " -ithes " submitted by Dr. L. R. Cox (*British Museum* (*Natural History*)) (application Z.N.(S.)415). I have discussed this question with Dr. Cox and with Professor Raymond C. Moore and have corresponded about it with Professor Wanner. At the end of the present note I submit, in agreement with Dr. Cox, a suggestion which both meets the objects which he has in view and at the same time provides the relief in regard to names for Pelmatozoa published with the termination " -crinites " sought by Professor Wanner and his colleagues.

(1) Dr. L. R. Cox's general proposal relating to generic names having the terminations " -ites ", " -ytes " and " -ithes "

2. Dr. Cox's application for the rejection of certain classes of generic names published for genera of fossil species and bearing the terminations " -ites ", " -ytes " or " ithes " is annexed as Document 36/2. This proposal is confined to those generic names of the foregoing general class which are based upon the names of genera previously established either for living or fossil species. Dr. Cox has deliberately excluded from his application generic names bearing the foregoing terminations where the name in question was published only for living species, since such names fall outside the field now under consideration. He has excluded also names published with the foregoing terminations for genera of fossils in cases where the generic name in question is not derivative from the name of a previously established genus. This second exclusion will leave as available names a certain number of early names which have never come into general use. Dr. Cox recognises that the continued availability of such names constitutes a threat to stability, for at any time any of these names might be substituted by some author for well-established names. In a letter (dated 7th April, 1949) on this subject, Dr. Cox wrote : " It will probably be best to draw up a list of ' -ites ' names not covered by this application which it is desirable to suppress and to submit the whole list to be dealt with under the plenary powers ". In further correspondence Dr. Cox explained that the preparation of the list which he had undertaken to compile would be " rather a formidable task and involve research in quite a number of early works, even so far as the Mollusca are concerned ". He suggested also that for other groups help should be sought from palaeontologists who were specialists in those groups (letter of 25th October, 1949). For various reasons the required lists are not at present available. In view of the impending meetings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and of the International Congress of Zoology, it has been considered that the best course is to submit the general problem for consideration at those meetings.

(2) Professor J. Wanner's proposal relating to the emendation to " crinus " of the termination " -crinites " in the case of generic names published for species of Pelmatozoa

3. Early in 1950 an application was received, through Dr. Henning Lemche (Copenhagen), from Professor J. Wanner on the subject of the special case presented by generic names published for species of Pelmatozoa originally published with the termination " -crinites ". This proposal (in an English translation kindly prepared by Dr. Lemche) is annexed hereto as Document 36/3. Dr. Wanner's suggestion was that names belonging to the foregoing class should be retained but that these names should be deemed to have been published with the termination " -crinus ", to which many of them were (irregularly) emended by Agassiz (1835), whose action was widely followed by later workers.

This application is here reproduced as Document 36/3. This application was supported at the time of its receipt by statements furnished respectively by the late Dr. Th. Mortensen (*Universitetets Zoologisk Museum, Copenhagen*) and Professor Torsten Gislén (*Lunds Universitets Zoologiska Institution, Lund, Sweden*). These notes are annexed as Documents 36/4 and 36/5. At a later date Professor Raymond C. Moore (*University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) indicated his sympathy with the objects entertained by Professor Wanner but expressed a preference for proceeding by way of validating the use of the " -crinus " termination for a specified number of generic names of Crinoids ; he mentioned eighty as the number possibly involved (Document 36/6). On receipt of this suggestion Professor Moore was asked to furnish the list which he had suggested. This he agreed to do, but pressure of other work subsequently prevented the accomplishment of this task.

4. In so far as the generic names originally published with the termination " -crinites " which Professor Wanner and his colleagues desire to retain with the emended termination " -crinus " are not derivatives of names previously applied to genera established for living species, the application applied to genera established for living species, the application (Z.N.(S.)447) received from Professor Wanner is entirely distinct from the earlier application (Z.N.(S.)415) submitted by Dr. Cox. When, however, we come to those names with " -ites " terminations which are derivatives of names previously applied to genera established either for living or fossil species, the two applications are identical, since under each those names would be preserved with the emended termination " -crinus " (in place of " -crinites "), the older version being deprived of rights under the Law of Priority.

(3) A combined proposal

5. In the light of the considerations explained above, the following proposal combining the application submitted by Dr. Cox with the special proposal in regard to Crinoid names submitted by Professor Wanner and his colleagues is submitted for consideration by the International Commission :—

Proposals relating to names published for genera of fossils with the termination " -ites "

(1) Where a fossil species has been described, figured, or referred to, under a generic name based upon the name of a genus previously established either for living or fossil species and (a) that name has for this purpose been modified by the addition to, or by the substitution for, the original termination, of the termination " -ites ", " -ytes " or " -ithes ", sometimes preceded by an additional consonant, and (b) there is no clear evidence that there was any intention on the part of the author

concerned that the name in question should designate a distinct generic group, the term so used shall, subject to the provisions of (3) below (relating to names published with the termination " -crinites "), possess no status under the Law of Priority but shall retain its rights under the Law of Homonymy.

(2) No generic name currently in use is to be rejected in favour of a name published with any of the terminations specified in (1) (a) above but not derived from a name given to a genus of living species which at the date of the adoption of the provision specified in (1) above was not in general use, until, on an application being submitted to it, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature shall so direct.

(3) Where a generic name that is not an emendation of a previously published name ending in " -crinus " has been published with the termination " -crinites " for a genus of species belonging to the group Pelmatozoa, that name is to be emended to bear the termination " -crinus ", and, on being so emended, is to rank for purposes of priority as from the date on which it was published with the termination "-crinites " and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published.

DOCUMENT 36/2

By **L. R. COX,** M.A., Sc.D., F.R.S. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*) *London*)

REQUEST FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF CERTAIN GENERIC NAMES WITH THE TERMINATIONS " -ITES ", " -YTES " AND " -ITHES " PUBLISHED BY EARLY AUTHORS FOR FOSSIL GENERA

Enclosure to a letter dated 14th March, 1949

This note is an application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to issue a *Declaration* to the effect that " Where a fossil species has been described, figured, or referred to under a generic name based on the name of a genus previously established in binominal literature either for living or fossil species, that name being modified by the addition or substitution for its original termination of the termination '*ites*', '*ytes*' or '*ithes*', sometimes preceded by a consonant, and there is no clear evidence that there was any intention that the name in question should designate a distinct generic group, the term so used is not to be accepted as a generic name and possesses no rights under the Law of Priority ".

The object of this application is the suppression of a series of names published in early binominal literature which, although hitherto ignored by the majority of workers, are not at present excluded from availability by any section of the International Rules, and which therefore constitute a threat to stability in nomenclature.

The practice of adding the suffix "*ites*" (Greek ίτης) to a name when referring to a fossil species originated with Aristotle and Pliny, and was continued by many authors of the 15th-18th centuries who discussed fossils, often without appreciating their true nature. Consequently, when Linnaeus and his successors established many older names as generic names in binominal literature there also existed in the old literature a number of derivative names terminating in "*ites*". With the adoption of binominal nomenclature one group of naturalists, including Linnaeus himself, referred many fossils to living genera, or, when founding new genera for fossils, did not consistently employ names ending in "*ites*". Other naturalists, however, even when adopting binominal nomenclature, continued to use the "*ites*" derivative names when dealing with fossil species and coined new "*ites*" names when none already existed. Lamarck (1801, *Système des Animaux sans Vertèbres :* vii) refers to this practice as "l'usage généralement établi parmi les Lithologistes et les Crystologistes, de terminer uniformément le nom de toutes les dépouilles des corps vivans qui sont dans l'état fossile, et dans ce cas de transformer le nom de *peigne* en *pectinite*, de turbo en *turbinite*, &c.".

The terminations "*ithes*" and "*lithes*" (presumably derived from the Greek λίθος) occasionally take the place of "*ites*", and it is suggested the *Declaration* should apply also to derivative generic names with these endings. Occasionally "*ytes*" is used instead of "*ites*".

The attitude of modern palaeontologists to these names is shown by the following two quotations. F. A. Bather (1898, *Natural Science*, 12 : 251) states, "The termination '*ites*' was generally applied to the organism when in a fossil state, but was not held to indicate generic distinction . . . It has never been maintained that the chance addition of this suffix constituted a difference of name, and all modern authors on Crinoidea have merely dropped it as out of harmony with modern views as to the nature of fossils". W. D. Lang, S. Smith and H. D. Thomas (*Index of Palaeozoic Coral Genera* (1940, *Brit. Mus.* (*Nat. Hist.*) : 14, 83, 86) reject the names *Acroporites*, *Madreporites* and *Milleporites* as "merely names indicating fossil forms of *Acropora*, *Madrepora* and *Millepora*".

It has been considered desirable to stipulate that the proposed *Declaration* should not apply to cases where there is clear evidence that the "*ites*" name referred to a different generic group from the living genus whose name it suggests. Thus *Brachyurites* Schlotheim (Crustacean genus) could not be suppressed as a derivative of *Brachyurus* Fischer (mammalian genus). There are also cases when the genus bearing the "*ites*" name belongs to the same family as the genus from whose name this was derived, but has a different generic diagnosis associated with it (*e.g.*, Lamarck gave different diagnoses for *Nautilites* and *Nautilis*).

It is necessary that the *Declaration* should cover cases of the addition of the "*ites*" termination to generic names published only for fossil groups (*e.g.*, Kruger's alteration of the names *Venericardia* and *Plagiostoma* to *Venericardites* and *Plagiostomatites*.

If the suggested *Declaration* is issued, there will still remain a number of early generic names with the termination " *ites* " (1) which have not been generally adopted, although they cannot be regarded as derivatives of names of living genera. Such names (*e.g.*, *Brachyurites* Schlotheim, *Macrourites* Schlotheim) would be best suppressed by supplementary *Opinions*. Some early " *ites* " names which are not derivative names (*e.g.*, *Hippurites*, *Radiolites*, *Tentaculites*) are in general use. The only " *ites* " derivative name which, to the writer's knowledge, was ever widely adopted was *Myacites* Schlotheim, a derivative of *Mya* Linnaeus. This name is not, however, used by modern authors. The proposed decision would, therefore, affect no generic names which are in general use at the present day.

Notes on Certain Authors Involved

Examination of names terminating in " *ites* " which are indexed as generic names by Sherborn and Neave shows that authors publishing them may be divided into three categories.

(a) Authors who should not be accepted as binominal and whose " *ites* " names should, therefore, be attributed to later authors who adopted them. Among such non-binominal authors are

Gesner, J., 1758. *Tractatus Physicus de Petrificatis*

Martini, F. H. W., 1767. " Nachricht von einigen seltenen Anomiten ". *Berlin. Mag.*, iv, pp. 36–57.

Guettard, J. E., 1770. " Douxième Mémoire, qui renferm l'ordre, suivant lequel on à cru pouvoir arranger les Polypites ". *Meme. diff. Part. Sci. Arts*, ii, pp. 312–444.

Martin, W., 1809. *Petrificats Derbiensia*. [Martin employs a peculiar trinominal nomenclature, his trivial names being binominal. Among the first components of his trivial names are several ending in " *ites* " which have been indexed as generic names by Sherborn and Neave. Martin's generic names all end in " *lithus* " and have never been adopted.] (2)

(*b*) Binominal author whose names terminating in " *ites* " cannot be accepted as generic names :—

Gmelin, J. F., 1793. Systema Naturae (Linné), ed. 13, vol. iii. [In the " Larvata " section of this volume are several names with the termination "*ites*" which appear on various pages in the left-hand column devoted to trivial names. This volume should in any case be suppressed*. The generic names all terminate in "*lithus*" and have been ignored by later workers.

---

(1) And also the termination " *lithus* ".

(2) Compare J. B. Knight, *Bull. Zool Nomencl.*, **1**, 1947, p. 260.

(*c*) Authors to whom the Declaration would apply.

The chief authors who have come to notice are :—

Leske, N. G., 1778. New edit. of J. T. Klein, *Naturalis Dispositio Echinodermatum*. [The names affected are *Cidarites*, *Echinanthites*, *Echinites*, *Spatangites*].

Blumenbach, J. F., 1803. Specimen *Archaeologiae Telluris*. [All new names except *Bitubulites* and *Oolithes* are affected.]

Lamarck, J. B. de, 1804. "Mémoires sur les fossiles des environs de Paris." *Ann. Mus.*, v. [Lamarck proposes certain new generic names (*Discorbis*, *Lenticulina*, etc.) and describes certain species under the "*ites*" derivative names *Discorbites*, *Lenticulites*, etc.].

Schlotheim, E. F. von, 1813. "Beitrage zur Naturgeschichte der Verteincrungen" *Taschenb. f. Min.* (Leonhard), vii, pp. 3–134. [Numerous "*ites*" names, all derivative names except one.]

Wahlenberg, G., 1819. "Petrificata Telluris Suecanae." *Nov. Act. R. Soc. Upsala*, viii. [All "*ites*" names except three, are derivative names.]

Schlotheim, E. F. von, 1820. *Die Petrefact-enkunde auf ihrem jetzigen Standpunkte*. [Numerous "*ites*" names, of which all but a few are derivative names ; of these few, some have been adopted by later workers and some ignored.]

Krüger, J. F., 1823. *Geschichte der Urwelt*, ii. [Generic names terminating in "*ites*" or "*lithes*" are used throughout the fossil invertebrate part of this work, and the decision would affect all of those newly published.]

Salter, J. W., 1857. "On Annelide-Burrows from the Longmynd." *Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc.*, xiii, pp. 199–206. [Proposes a new name *Arenicolites* as an emendation of *Arenicola* " to make the name more symmetrical with other terms of general import."]

---

* A proposal to this end has already been submitted to the International Commission. See Winckworth, 1951 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 38).

DOCUMENT 36/3

By **J. WANNER** (*Scheidegg/Algäu, Bavaria, Germany*)

"-CRINITES " OR "-CRINUS " ?

Communicated by Dr. Henning Lemche under cover of a letter
dated 3rd January, 1950.

During the first third of the last century specialists, when publishing new generic names for true Crinoidea, normally selected names ending in " -crinites ". (For example, *Pentacrinites* of Blumenbach, 1804 ; *Actinocrinites*, *Apiocrinites*, *Cyathocrinites*, *Eugeniacrinites*, *Platycrinites*, *Poteriocrinites*, *Rhodocrinites*, of Miller, 1821 ; *Caryocrinites* of Say, 1825 ; *Cupressocrinites*, *Eucalyptocrinites*, *Melocrinites* of Goldfusz, 1826 ; *Echinoencrinites* of von Meyer, 1826 ; *Scyphocrinites* of Zenker, 1833 ; and *Haplocrinites* of Steininger, 1834). In the year 1835 L. Agassiz (1835, *Mém. Soc. sci. nat. Neuchâtel* 1, 5 : 168) proposed substituting for the ending " -crinites " the ending " -crinus," which up till that time had appeared only once, namely in the case of the now no longer valid genus, *Ollacrinus* Cumberland, 1826. This proposal was received at once with general acclamation. Thus within a year J. Philipps (1836, *Ill. Geology of Yorkshire*, II, London) named the new Crinoid genera which he established in that work *Euryocrinus* and *Gilbertsocrinus*. In 1837 there appeared *Isocrinus* and *Chelocrinus* of von Meyer ; in 1839, *Dichocrinus* and *Triacrinus* of von Münster ; in 1840 *Ctenocrinus* of Bronn ; in 1842 *Stephanocrinus* and *Nucleocrinus* of Conrad ; in 1843 *Marsupiocrinus* of Morris, *Pleurocrinus* of T. & T. Austin, and *Taxocrinus* of Philipps ; in 1847, *Glyptocrinus* of Hall, and so on and so forth.

It is true that a certain number of specialists when establishing new genera still for a time adhered or reverted sometimes to the older form of ending " -crinites ". For example, *Dimerocrinites* of Philipps, 1839 ; *Cryptocrinites* of von Buch, 1840 ; *Heliocrinites* and *Protocrinites* of Eichwald, 1840 ; *Pseudocrinites* of Pearce, 1842 ; *Agelacrinites* of Vanuxem, 1842 ; *Crotalocrinites*, *Periechocrinites*, *Sagenocrinites* and *Sycocrinites* of T. & T. Austin, 1842 ; *Hexacrinites* of T. & T. Austin, 1843 ; *Bactocrinites* of Schnur, 1849 and *Zeacrinites* of Troost, 1849. At this point, however, the period during which new genera were published with the ending " -crinites " was finally closed. The older names such as *Poteriocrinites* etc. rapidly disappeared from the literature and were replaced by the later forms *Poteriocrinus* etc. The older forms still appeared from time to time in certain genera of Crinoidea, as for example Sandberger & Sandberger, 1856 (*Haplocrinites*), Meek & Worthen, 1866, 1869, 1873 (*Poteriocrinites*, *Actinocrinites*, *Cyathocrinites*), Carpenter, 1884 (*Glypto-*

crinites) and Reed, 1908 (*Bactrocrinites*). There are also a few isolated instances where generic names which had originally been published with the newer ending " -crinus " had been emended to the older form " -crinites ". Thus, for example, Geinitz, 1846, changed *Carpocrinus* Müller, 1840 into *Carpocrinites* and *Dichocrinus* Münster, 1839, into *Dichocrinites*, although on the other hand he changed *Pseudocrinites* Pearce, 1842, into *Pseudocrinus* (his position was thus not consistent) ; Chapman, 1857,changed *Calliocrinus* d'Orbigny, 1849, into *Calliocrinites* and Steininger, 1849 and 1853, changed *Ctenocrinus* Bronn, 1840 into *Ctenocrinites*. Apart from these exceptions, however, the practical proposal of Agassiz had been put into general application.

In this way names such as *Poteriocrinus* etc. had for a hundred years become deeply embedded in general textbooks and handbooks of geology and palaeontology when R. S. Bassler (1938, *Foss. Catal. I. Anim.*, pars 83.'s-Gravenhage) on the basis of a strict application of the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique*, reverted to the original forms of these names, which he used also in his Index of Palaeozoic Pelmatozoa (Bassler, R. S. & M. W. Moodey, 1943, *Geol. Soc. America*, Spec. Pap. No. 45). We are concerned here with two works which fully deserve our respect and admiration, and which, on account of their completeness (insofar as this is attainable) and reliability, will for a long time to come constitute an indispensible tool for every worker in the field of Echinoderms. Moreover, it is not as though the re-introduction of the original forms of names affected only one or two genera. Bassler's " rectification " affects not less than 25 palaeozoic genera, and a whole series of more recent genera including many which are widely distributed, containing a large number of species and are familiar to every geologist, such as *Poteriocrinus*, *Cyathocrinus*, *Apiocrinus*, the genus *Pentacrinus*, well-known to every zoologist, and in addition, as we shall see, carries with it such far-reaching consequences that one cannot help asking whether Bassler's action was necessary or useful.

The fact that Bassler is formally in the right cannot of course be disputed. Article 19 of the *Règles* states : " L'orthographe originelle d'un nom doit être conservée, à moins qu'il ne soit évident que ce nom renferme une faute de transcription, d'orthographe ou d'impression."

We are however of the opinion that in the present case the restoration of the original form of these names is not absolutely necessary, and sincerely regret that in this matter we are not able to agree with our honoured friend Dr. Bassler. We set out below the reasons for our disagreement :

(1) The *Règles* themselves, like all human laws, are imperfect, since their authors were not able to foresee all the unintended consequences to which their application might in certain cases give rise.

(2) The action of Agassiz and others in changing the ending of certain generic names from " -crinites " to " -crinus " has never given rise to any

misunderstanding. No one has ever had the slightest doubt that *Poteriocrinus*, *Cupressocrinus*, *Melocrinus*, etc. had exactly the same meaning as *Poteriocrinites*, *Cupressocrinites*, *Melocrinites*, etc. Nor have any of the innumerable authors who, subsequent to the introduction of the *Règles*, have adopted the later forms for these names, thereby continually offending against Article 19 of the *Règles*, regarded the offence as sufficiently grave as seriously to regard these forms as invalid. Even Dr. F. A. Bather, in his time the greatest authority in the field of fossil Echinoderms and himself a member of the Internation Commission of Zoological Nomenclature, never thought of adhering to the *Règles* in this matter. On the contrary, he was one of the most active supporters of the simplified form of these names, and went even further : " I do not plead ", he said (1926, *The Naturalist*, No. 30 : 81), " for a strict adherence to the International Rules of Nomenclature in every occasional publication. Though a member of the International Commission, I am no priority fan."

(3) The restoration of the original forms of these names is, in our view, inexpedient, since it would have the following undesirable consequences :

(*a*) In the case of all species which were published after the introduction of the revised formats of the generic names, the names of the authors would have to be placed in brackets : thus we should have to write, for example, *Cupressocrinites hieroglyphicus* (Schultze) instead of, as hitherto, *Cupressocrinus hieroglyphicus* Schultze. According to Bassler & Moodey (1943), for example, the genus *Platycrinus* contains some 157 valid species ; if these species were now to be referred to *Platycrinites*, it would be necessary to place brackets round the names of the authors in not less than 143 cases. In the case of *Cyathocrinus* brackets would be neeced in 84 cases out of 93 ; for *Melocrinus*, 63 out of 76 ; and for *Eucalyptocrinus*, 43 out of 47 ; and so on. Moreover, hitherto, whenever we have seen an author's name in brackets, we knew that when the species in question was first published it had been placed by its author in another genus. If now we were to follow the procedure of Bassler, we should henceforth never know for sure for what reason an author's name had been placed in brackets : the brackets might still have the same significance as before, but could equally well signify that the author in question had originally placed the species in the same genus as that to which it was currently referred, but that he had not employed the original ending for the generic name. Thus in the case of *Hexacrinites brevis* (Goldfusz), for example, the author's name has to be placed in brackets because Goldfusz described his species originally as *Platycrinites brevis* ; in the case of *Hexacrinites nodifer* (Schultze) on the other hand, the author's name is bracketed because he originally described the species as *Hexacrinus nodifer*. In the case of 36 species of *Hexacrinus* which are recognised today, the bracketing of the author's name would have the latter of these meanings, and in the case of 13 species the former.

(*b*) The restoration of the original forms for these generic names would lead to corresponding changes in certain family names. We should have to write *Platycrinitidae* instead of *Platycrinidae*, *Hexacrinitidae* instead of *Hexacrinidae*, *Melocrinitidae*, *Cupressocrinitidae*, *Poteriocrinitidae* etc. But that would be only the relatively harmless beginning of a further complication. It is usual to attribute family names to their authors. The name-forms *Platycrinitidae* etc. originate from Bassler. Thus we now see R. C. Moore & F. B. Plummer (1938, *Denison Univ. Bull. J. Sci. Lab.* **32** : 236, Dec. 1937, publ. Feb. 1938) referring to the family *Poteriocrinitidae* Bassler, 1938 ; and R. C. Moore (*Denison Univ. Bull. J. Sci. Lab.* **34** : 198) referring again to the family *Poteriocrinitidae* Bassler, 1942 ; and W. E. Schmidt (*Abh. Reichstelle Bodenforschung* N. F. Heft 182, Berlin, 1941, publ. 29.3.1942) writing of the family *Platycrinitidae* Bassler, the family *Hexacrinitidae* Bassler, etc. The original founders of these families were, however, quite other persons. It is thus not only misleading but also contrary to historical justice to make no reference to the original author of a family, but to attribute the name to someone who has done no more than to transform a family name which originally ended in " -crinidae " into an exactly similar name, but ending in " -crinitidae ". Thus, in just recognition of this situation, Moore (*Denison Univ. Bull. J. Sci. Lab.* 35) referred already in 1940 to the family *Poteriocrinitidae* Roemer, and added in a footnote (: 35) " Earlier papers (Moore & Plummer, 1938 : 236 ; Moore, 1939 : 198) that list this family in the name of Bassler are believed to have been incorrect in transferring designation of authorship from Roemer to Bassler since it was Roemer who formulated the concept of this family on the basis of a type genus, *Poteriocrinites* Miller, which he improperly followed authors in calling *Poteriocrinus*. Bassler merely emended this spelling to make it conform to the correct designation of the type genus." Accordingly we find also in Moore & Plummer (1940, *The Univ. of Texas*, Publ. No. 3945) : *Dimerocrinitidae* Bather, *Rhodocrinitidae* Roemer, *Melocrinitidae* Zittel, *Poteriocrinitidae* Roemer, etc., although later on, in Moore & Laudon (1943, *Geol. Soc. America*, Spec. Pap. No. 46), we are surprised to find once again *Poteriocrinitidae* Bassler, *Cyathocrinitidae* Bassler etc. Bassler himself tries to do justice not only to himself but to the original author also when he writes : (Bassler & Moodey, 1943) Family *Poteriocrinitidae* Bassler (*Poteriocrinidae* Roemer) etc. This method of citation may be shortened in accordance with the procedure of Regnéll (1945) to Fam. *Poteriocrinitidae* (Roemer) Bassler, but nevertheless the necessity of citing two authors to one family name remains an unwelcome burden, which would arise in the case of 16 families in the Class *Crinoidea*, especially since in certain circumstances it might well appear necessary to add also the name of the author of the latest taxonomic revision of the family itself.

(4) In former systems of classification the ending " -crinitidae " has sometimes been used for higher systematic units, *e.g.*, Wachsmuth & Springer (1879–1886, *Rev. of the Palaeocriniidea*, P. I–III. Philadelphia,

and 1897, *North American Crinoidea Camerata*) used *Actinocrinites Hexacrinites*, *Melocrinites*, *Periechocrinites*, *Platycrinites*, as Section names in the sense of subfamilies, and Jaekel (1918, *Pal. Zeitschr.* 3. Berlin) used *Cyathocrinites* and *Poteriocrinites* in the sense of sub-Orders of the Order *Fistulata.*

(5) The forms such as *Poteriocrinus*, etc. have been accepted for more than 100 years.

The fact that the forms ending in " -crinus " and " -crinidae " are shorter and simpler than those ending in " -crinites " and " -crinitidae " may be noted incidentally, since this cannot be regarded as a decisive point, though it is perhaps not entirely without weight.

The reception which Bassler's proposal has found in recent literature is divided, as might have been foreseen, but this is of no great significance, since, as Moore, Weller Knight (1942, *J. Palaeontology*, **16** : 250—261) very rightly remark, there will always in such cases be some authors who are " agnostics ", in the sense that they have no independent views of their own, but merely follow other authors. Moore, Moore & Plummer, Moore & Laudon, as has already been indicated, have followed Bassler in using the ending " -crinites " and " -crinitidae ", as have also W. Goldring, G. Regnéll, G. Ubaghs, J. Wright. On the other hand E. Kirk, de Marez-Oyens, G. Delpey, H. Sieverts-Doreck, J. Wanner, and N. N. Yakovlev have stuck firmly to the forms " -crinus " and " -crinidae ". A statistical analysis of this kind would only have any sense if all the authors concerned were fully conversant with the basic arguments on both sides of this disputed question. We are convinced that in this case the majority would be in favour of retaining the ending " -crinus ". The reception of Th. Mortensen's action for the retention of *Encrinus*, *Archaeocidaris* and other Echinoderm names (1932, *Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist.* **10** : 345–368) has shown clearly that nearly all workers are prepared to support well-founded proposals, even when they are not in accordance with the strict letter of the *Règles*.

We should like, therefore, to lay the following question before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :

Would it be better, (*a*) in the case of all Pelmatozoa names which were originally published with the ending " -crinites " to retain this name-form, or, would it be better, (*b*) in the case of all Pelmatozoa generic names which were originally formed with the ending " -crinites " to emend them, under the plenary powers, so that the corresponding names with the ending " -crinus " instead of " -crinites " would then become the valid names. The original author's name could then be appended to each of these generic names as though he had himself used the emended spelling.

Personally, we are of the opinion that the problem could best be solved by the adoption of the second of these two courses.

DOCUMENT 36/4

By the late **TH. MORTENSEN**

(*Universitetets Zoologisk Museum, Copenhagen*)

Note dated 2nd January, 1950.

I am in full agreement with Professor Wanner as to the desirability of reaching uniformity in the nomenclature of Crinoids. I wish urgently to recommend that the termination " -crinus " and " -CRINIDAE " be made obligatory.

DOCUMENT 36/5

By **TORSTEN GISLÉN**

(*Lunds Universitets Zoologiska Institution, Lund, Sweden*)

Professor J. Wanner, one of the most prominent scientists in Echinoderm palaeontology of today, has made a proposal to use the termination " -crinus " instead of " -crinites ". Though in many cases this will be in opposition to the strict application of the nomenclatorial Rules, it seems to me that he has brought forward the argument in support of his proposition in such a convincing way that I gladly recommend his proposal.

DOCUMENT 36/6

By **RAYMOND C. MOORE**
(*University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*)

Extract from a letter dated 2nd June, 1950.

A few days ago, I received from Dr. Prof. J. Wanner a statement entitled " *-crinites* oder *-crinus* ", in which is raised a far-reaching question of nomenclature as applied to fossil crinoids. It is my understanding that with endorsement of Professor T. Gislén of Sweden and Dr. T. Mortensen of Denmark, this communication has been transmitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature with recommendation and request to the Commission that " all generic names of pelmatozoans which originally were published with the termination -crinites shall by suspension of the rules be altered to an ending in -crinus." Perhaps I am mistaken in thinking that this matter has formally been laid before the Commission.

I quite understand and am sympathetic to objectives of Dr. Wanner, but for several reasons I think that it would be very undesirable to take the sweeping sort of action suggested by him. It is my own view and I think that I can speak for several other specialists in study of crinoids that either (*a*) no suspension of the rules should be invoked or that (*b*) suspension of the rules should be in form of action on a specific list of generic terms for validation and entry on the *Official List of Generic Names*. I should not be opposed to the latter form of action provided there is reasonable assurance that the Commission might effectuate this suspension within not more than a year's time. My reason for this is that within the year we expect to have manuscript for the crinoid section of the TREATISE ON INVERTEBRATE PALEONTOLOGY ready for press and whatever is published here certainly will tend to fix nomenclatural procedure affecting these organisms.

I agree strongly with Dr. Karl P. Schmidt in expression published in *Science*, March 3, 1950, along with your own discussion of zoological nomenclature in judging that a much larger use of the *Official List* by the Commission will tend to remove many nomenclatural difficulties. I strongly disagree with some views expressed by the Smithsonian discussion group ; and most of all, I think that it will greatly help nomenclatural aspects of zoological science if ambiguities of the *Règles* can be removed as in the new draft, and if the sterile hunt for priorities which upset long established terms can largely be circumvented through actions of the Commission in use of its *Official List*.

CASE NO. 37

ARTICLE 25, PROVISO (a) : PROPOSED INSERTION OF WORDS TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT A TRIVIAL NAME HAVING AS ITS INDICATION ONLY A QUALIFIED REFERENCE TO A PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED TRIVIAL NAME DOES NOT SATISFY THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE FOREGOING PROVISO.

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)349)

DOCUMENT 37/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

REPORT ON THE ADOPTION BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE ON THE ADOPTION OF A " DECLARATION " ON THE QUESTION OF THE AVAILABILITY OF A TRIVIAL NAME HAVING AS ITS INDICATION ONLY A QUALIFIED REFERENCE TO A PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED TRIVIAL NAME

The question whether a qualified reference to a previously published trivial name unaccompanied by any other particulars constitutes for a trivial name an " indication " for the purposes of Proviso (*a*) to Article 25 was raised first in an application submitted by Dr. Angua M. Woodbury and Dr. Hobart M. Smith (*University of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) on the question of the name to be accepted as the oldest available name for the race of the yellow rattlesnakes of the Colorado River Basin. As the issue so raised involved a question of principle, it fell, under the procedure prescribed in 1948, to be dealt with not by an *Opinion* but by an interpretative *Declaration*. In agreement with the authors referred to above, such a *Declaration* was asked for in a note by the Secretary published in September 1951 (Hemming, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 103–105).

2. Terms of the " Declaration " voted upon by the International Commission : The following is the text of the proposed *Declaration* on which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature voted by post in 1952 :—

> A trivial name published without descriptive matter of any kind, except a qualified (*i.e.* doubtful or provisional) synonymic reference to an older trivial name that had been validly published with an indication, definition or description is to be treated as having been published without an " indication " for the purposes of Proviso (*a*) to Article 25. A trivial name so published is to be treated as a *nomen nudum* possessing no status in zoological nomenclature.

3. Adoption on 22nd August, 1952 of a " Declaration " banning as having published without an " indication " any trivial name which, when first published was accompanied only by a qualified synonymic reference to a previously published such name : The Internationl Commission adopted on 22nd August, 1952 a *Declaration* on the foregoing subject in the terms of the draft set out in paragraph 2 above. Of the eighteen members of the International Commission there voted in favour of the proposed *Declaration* the following seventeen Commissioners (arranged in the order in which votes were received) : W. T. Calman ; E. M. Hering,; J. R. Dymond ; B. Hankó ; P. Bonnet ; H. E. Vokes ; J. C. Bradley ; A. do Amaral ; F. Hemming ; T. Esaki ; N. D. Riley ; H. Lemche ; R. Mertens ; J. Pearson ; N. R. Stoll ; H. Boschma ; A. Cabrera. No Commissioner voted against the proposed *Declaration*. No vote was received from T. Jaczewski.

4. Submission of " Declaration " by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology : Under the procedure governing the rendering by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of *Declarations* interpreting the *Règles* an interpretation so given becomes operative immediately, but it is the duty of the International Commission to submit a *Declaration* so adopted to the next International Congress of Zoology for final approval. In accordance with the foregoing procedure, the *Declaration* set out in paragraph 2 of the present note adopted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by 17 votes (one Commissioner not voting) is hereby submitted to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology for final approval.

CASE NO. 38

ARTICLE 28 : PROPOSED RESTORATION, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, OF THE FIRST REVISER PRINCIPLE

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)682)

DOCUMENT 38/1

Introductory Note by **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

The annexed papers are all concerned to secure the complete or partial revocation of the decision taken at Paris in 1948 by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology (on the advice of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature) to substitute in Article 28 the principle of page, line and word precedence for the principle of the First Reviser (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 257–258, 328–331).

2. Although the general object of the proposals now submitted is similar, the actual proposals brought forward differ from one another in certain respects. It may, therefore, be convenient to provide the following summary of the recommendations received :—

(1) Complete return to the First Reviser principle :

This is advocated by (1) the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum (Document 38/2), (2) Professor Rudolf Richter (Document 38/4) and Dr. Henning Lemche (Document 38/5).

(2) Return to the First Reviser Principle, a *Recommendation* to be added urging First Revisers in future to " follow the principle of page precedence except where good reason is stated for doing otherwise " :

This is the course recommended by the Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, D.C. (Document 38/3).

(3) Return to the First Reviser principle in respect of the period ending 31st December, 1953, and, as from 1st January, 1954, the adoption of page precedence " in all cases in which a First Reviser has not acted before 1st January, 1954 " :

This is the course recommended by the Society of Systematic Zoology (Document 38/6).

3. Need for a definition of the action constituting action by a First Reviser : The return, as proposed, to the First Reviser principle will make it necessary once again to consider the problem of what constitutes the selection of one of two or more contending names of equal date by a First Reviser. The problem here is similar to that involved in determining whether a given author has or has not effectively selected a given nominal species under Rule (*g*) in Article 30 to the type species of a genus established without a designated or indicated type species. The difficulty here is substantial, for, although the foregoing Rule provides that the expression " select a ' type species ' " is to be " rigidly construed ", specialists have found it necessary to obtain rulings upon a number of situations where it was doubtful—or at least was open to argument—whether Rule (*g*) had been duly complied with by a given author. It was, no doubt, the lack of a definition as to what constitutes a selection by a First Reviser which in the past has led in some groups to inconsistencies in the application of Article 28 and indeed to the disregard of its provisions. The following suggested provision is put forward as a basis for the discussion of this important question :

Draft of a definition of the action required to be taken by an author to constitute a selection by a " First Reviser " under Article 28.

> The expression " selection by a First Reviser " is to be rigidly construed, and such a selection is to be deemed to have been effected only when an author, after citing names published in the same book and on the same date for two or more nominal species (or subspecies), clearly indicates by whatever method, (*a*) that he is of the opinion that those nominal species (or subspecies) represent the same taxonomic unit, and (*b*) that he is selecting one of the names concerned, to the exclusion of the other names, to be the name to be used for that taxonomic unit.

4. Need for a saving clause to protect from disturbance well-established names already brought into use in accordance with the principle of page precedence : In its present application the Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, based their objection, in part, to the 1948 decision to substitute the page precedence principle for that of the first reviser on the ground that this necessarily led to name-changing of a kind calculated to give rise to instability and confusion (Document 38/3). It is a fact that any change in the *Règles* and, in most cases, any clarification of existing provisions is liable to lead to difficulties of this kind. In the present instance an attempt was made at Paris to ward off this danger by the adoption of a provision (i) that, where the adoption of the provision then agreed upon (*i.e.* the adoption of the page precedence principle) would lead to a change in the name of a taxonomic unit of importance, specialists might apply to the International Commission for the use of its plenary powers to maintain existing nomenclatorial practice, (ii) that, on such an application being submitted, no change in that practice was to be made by any author until the Commission made known its decision on the application submitted to it, and (iii) that it should be the duty of the Commission to give sympathetic consideration to applications of the foregoing type, when submitted to it (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 330, Point (2) (*a*) and (*b*)). It is suggested that, on the repeal of the Paris decision on the question of page precedence, a safeguard at least as effective as that embodied in the decision in favour of the principle now proposed to be reversed will be needed if extensive and objectionable name-changing is to be avoided.

DOCUMENT 38/2

By the COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE CHICAGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM

Extract from a letter dated 15th May, 1952.

The Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum proposes modifications of and additions to the Rules of Zoological Nomenclature as below stated. These proposals * are submitted to the International Commission more than one year in advance of the International Zoological Congress at Copenhagen with the request that they be put to a vote at the Section of Nomenclature of said Congress.

Proposal 1

We propose that, if two names for the same taxonomic unit are proposed in the same publication, such names are to be considered as of equal priority. The name selected by the first reviser shall become the valid name.

Reasons : This rule was part of the Rules of Nomenclature from 1901 to 1948. It has often permitted the first reviser to select the better known of two names, even though it might have been published on a later line or page. The retroactive change of this rule at Paris (1948) seriously threatens the stability of nomenclature and should be rejected categorically.

Since the first reviser has the privilege of selecting the name that has page or line priority, names stabilised on the basis of such selection are in no case threatened by the first reviser rule, while the reciprocal is *not* true.

KARL P. SCHMIDT
Dr. FRITZ HAAS
LOREN P. WOODS
ROBERT F. INGER
A. L. RAND (mostly reservations about the form of Proposal 3)
EMMET R. BLAKE
RUPERT L. WENZEL
COLIN CAMPBELL SANBORN
CLIFFORD H. POPE
D. DWIGHT DAVIS

---

* The other proposals submitted in this letter are being published at the appropriate points in the present volume.

DOCUMENT 38/3

By the NOMENCLATURE DISCUSSION GROUP, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Letter dated 16th July, 1952, from Dr. R. E. BLACKWELDER, *Secretary*

In response to your request for consideration of certain proposals to be presented to the Copenhagen Congress, we have prepared reports on several of them.

Two copies of each report* are enclosed herewith.

Annexe to Dr. Blackwelder's letter

Proposed Amendment to Restore the Rule of the First Reviser

The Nomenclature Discussion Group of Washington is convinced that in the past the International Code's rule of the first reviser has been faithfully followed by a large majority of zoologists, that a great many decisions have been made in good faith on that basis, and that a retroactive change in that rule has added to confusion and instability.

The Group is further convinced that even for the future, individual zoologists should be able to avoid confusion or disturbing changes by selecting a name published on a later page or line when there is good reason for so doing.

The Group therefore proposes to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the forthcoming International Congress of Zoology that the relevant action of the Paris Congress be reversed, and that the rule of the first reviser be restored to its pre-eminent position, as in the old Code, but with a recommendation that in the future, the first reviser shall follow the principle of page precedence except where good reason is stated for doing otherwise.

---

* The other Reports here referred to are being published elsewhere in the Copenhagen Series of documents. (intl'd) F.H. 29th May, 1953

DOCUMENT 38/4

By **RUDOLF RICHTER**
(*Natur-Museum und Forschungs-Institut, Senckenberg, Frankfurt a.M., Germany*)

Statement received on 18th July, 1952

(Ed. Note : The following statement, prior to its submission to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, had been published under the title " Seiten-Priorität ist keine Priorität " in June 1952 in the serial publication *Senckenbergiana* (33 (1/3) : 73–74).)

Auch das Prioritäts-Prinzip ist im Anfang missverstanden und übertrieben worden. Erst durch Schaden hat man den Weg zu einer stabilen und vernünftigen Nomenklatur zu suchen gelernt. Seit der Ermöglichung der Suspension der Regeln (1913) hat sich die Entwicklung der IRZN und der Internationalen Kommission auf diesem Wege bewegt. Wenn man sich auch, damals wie heute, allzu zeitraubend mit der Historie einzelner Namen aufgehalten hat, anstatt die Masse des wichtigen Tier-Namen mit grozzen Würfen endgültig festzulegen, so ist es doch, bei allen Stockungen und Schwankungen, nicht rückwärts gegangen.

Neuerdings aber, so unerwartet und enttäuschend das für alle sein muss, die der Nomenklatur nur den Wert eines Werkzeugs zubilligen, drohen Rückschritte zu längst überwundenen Standpunkten, bis in die Anfänge zurück.

Incredibile dictu : Die seit Einführung der Internationalen Regeln glücklich begrabene "*Seiten-Priorität*", ja sogar die "*Zeilen-Priorität*" *soll wieder exhumiert werden* ! Also die sklavische " Priorität " innerhalb derselben Veröffentlichung. Der Revisor, der aus wissenschaftlichen Gründen mehrere Arten oder Gattungen zusammenlegt, soll gezwungen werden, immer denjenigen Namen zu wählen, der in der betreffenden Veröffentlichung an erster Stelle erwähnt wird. Auch dann, wenn in der nächsten Zeile oder auf einer späteren Seite eine Name zur Verfügung steht, der eindeutiger typisiert, morphologisch besser begründet, geographisch oder stratigraphisch genauer erfassbar ist.

Muss die Vernunft, die in der Priorität liegen kann, derart zu Unsinn werden ? Leider haben auch einige hoch-verdiente Zoologen und Paläontologen sich bereits irreführen lassen, indem sie glaubten, sie seien tatsächlich seit 1948 zu Sklaven einer so sinnlosen und unlogischen " Priorität " geworden. Sie fühlen sich gezwungen, den " zeilen-älteren " Namen auch dann wählen zu müssen, wenn dieser Name mit Nachteilen, ja vielleicht mit unheilbarer Unsicherheit belastet ist und der Nomenklatur dauernde Schwierigkeiten bringen wird. Diese Revisoren und alle Autoren werden befreit aufatmen, wenn sie erkennen, dass ein solcher Zwang von Rechts wegen gar nicht besteht.

Im Gegensatz hierzu hat die Internationale Nomenklatur-Kommission bis 1948 immer energisch den Standpunkt vertreten, dass in einer Veröffentlichung *sämtliche Seiten und Zeilen als gleichzeitig veröffentlicht* anzusehen sind. Das Datum ist für alle Seiten dasselbe, von der ersten bis zur letzten.

Diese *innere Gleichzeitigkeit jeder Veröffentlichung* ist, wie gesagt, *notwendig für die Freiheit des Revisors* und damit für die Stabilität und Vernunft der Nomenklatur. Von solcher Freiheit hängt daher schliesslich auch die Sicherheit der Taxonomie ab, die Grundlage aller zoologischen Teilwissenschaften.

Die innere Gleichzeitigkeit ist aber auch *für die Freiheit des Autors nötig*, nämlich um den Autor vor Auslegungen *gegen* seine intentio zu schützen. Der Autor muss, wie bisher, die Freiheit behalten, *der letzen Seite* seiner Veröffentlichung *derseblen Wert* beizumessen wie der ersten. Er darf verlangen, dass der Leser dasselbe tut. Nicht nur deswegen, weil wir Autoren oft ein weiter hinten gedrucktes Kapitel früher schreiben als ein davor gedrucktes, oder gar die Einleitung zuletzt. Sondern vor allem deswegen, weil wir Autoren manchmal das weniger Wichtige und weniger Sichere *absichtlich* zuerst bringen und das besser Gesicherte danach. *Die Reihenfolge im Druck ist oft nur eine Sache der technischen Zweckmässigkeit und kann eine andere*, wenn nicht sogar die umgekehrte, sein als die *Reihenfolge der Sicherheit.*

Nicht genug mit der Fesselung von Gegenwart und Zukunft : Sogar für die Vergangenheit *rückwirkend* soll die neue " priority " nach " precedence in pages, lines and position in lines . . . be applied to all publications of post-Linnaean date " ! Nur wenn dadurch ein Name " of importance " gefährdet wird, " specialists may apply to the Commission ", um für ihn einen ausnahmsweisen Schutz in einem umständlichen Einzel-Verfahren zu erkämpfen. Alle normalen Namen, die gegen die neue " Priorität " verstossen, seien zu ändern, auch wenn sie seit 1758 unangefochten bestehen. *Neues Freiwild, schutzlos gemacht—durch die zu Schutz und Stabilisierung verpflichteten Hüter* !—Die Nomenklaturisten werden das Signal zur Jagd nur zu gut verstehen.

Gegen die Pariser Beschlüsse von 1948 ist von vielen Institutionen, zumal in Amerika Protest eingelegt worden, —sowohl wegen der Schädlichkeit wie wegen der rechtlichen Ungültigkeit. Für die Zoologen derjenigen Länder, die zu dem Kongress nicht eingeladen oder zugelassen waren und die daher an den Beratungen und Beschlüssen nicht mitwirken durften, ist die Ungültigkeit noch eindeutiger.

Die Beschlüsse haben also *keine internationale Gültigkeit.* Erst der Kongress in Kopenhagen 1953 wird bindende Beschlüsse fassen können. Es ist also noch Zeit, allerdings die höchste Zeit, die vorbereiteten Fesseln zurückzuweisen.

Die Deutsche Zoologische Gesellschaft und die Paläontologische Gesellschaft, haben eine gemeinsame Kommission für die erforderlichen Schritte eingesetzt.

DOCUMENT 38/5

By **HENNING LEMCHE** (*Universitetets Zoologisk Museum, Copenhagen*)
Letter dated 24th July, 1952

The objections from many zoologists (*e.g. Senckenbergiana* 33 : 193) appear to me to be so heavy that I think that the Commission should reconsider the case of page and line priority. Therefore, I hereby propose to place this question on the Agenda for the Commission at its Meeting in Copenhagen in 1953.

I propose that we return to the former procedure (it is still possible, but it is last time) to regard all pages simultaneously published as constituting a unity within which no priority can exist. The right of picking out the name to be used should be that of the " first reviser " as in the case of type species.

DOCUMENT 38/6

Statement of the views of the

NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY

Letter, dated 27th July, 1952, from Mr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman

I regard the ballot and comments attached to this letter as indicating a dual request to the International Commission, as follows :

1. That the substitution of page precedence for the rule of the first reviser should not apply to any case in which a first reviser has acted before January 1, 1954.

2. That from January 1, 1954, onward, page precedence should supplant the rule of the first reviser in all cases in which a first reviser has not acted before January 1, 1954.

APPENDIX 1 TO MR. FOLLETT'S LETTER OF 27th JULY, 1952

Memorandum and call for opinion, dated 4th July, 1952, issued to the undermentioned members of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology by Mr. Follett, Chairman

Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty,
Department of Zoology,
University of California,
Berkeley 4, California.

Dr. Laurence M. Klauber,
233 W. Juniper Street,
San Diego 1, California.

Dr. Charles D. Michener,
Department of Entomology,
University of Kansas,
Lawrence, Kansas.

Dr. Robert Rush Miller,
Museum of Zoology,
University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Dr. Curtis W. Sabrosky,
Room 202E,
U.S. National Museum,
Washington 25, D.C.

Dr. Robert L. Usinger,
Department of Entomology,
University of California,
Berkeley 4, California.

Dr. John W. Wells,
Department of Geology,
Cornell University,
Ithaca, New York.

Fellow members of the SSZ Nomenclature Committee :

On July 1, 1952, I wrote Dr. Sabrosky a letter, enclosing a copy of the " Emendations " paper that I had read at the recent symposium of the SSZ, Pacific Section, at Corvallis, Oregon. A copy of that letter and manuscript are enclosed herewith.

In reviewing Dr. John S. Garth's minutes of the symposium, I have since been reminded that it was the consensus of those present that the manuscript should be transmitted to the SSZ Nomenclature Committee, for the latter's consideration.

I now realise, however, that this matter presents a problem in addition to that of what action (if any) our committee should take with regard to the paper in question.

While preparing this paper, I received our committee's report of the vote on its second ballot. My copy of that report showed the following returns on proposition VI :

> " VI : Formerly, if an animal was named two or more times in the same book or paper, the first subsequent writer (the first reviser) selected one of the names, which was thenceforth used. At Paris a retroactive decision was made giving the first name priority (even if it appeared in the same line of print), thus making ' page priority ' binding.
>
> " 1. I prefer to accept page priority as always binding, both past and future, except in cases sufficiently important to warrant suspension of the rules.
>
> [79 votes]
>
> " 2. I prefer to accept page priority from January 1, 1954, onward, but in order to avoid changes in already well established names, I would follow the first reviser for all cases in which such a reviser has acted before January 1, 1954.
>
> [104 votes]
>
> " 3. I prefer to follow the rule of the first reviser for the future as well as to the past. (A strong recommendation could be added here, to the effect that a first reviser should follow page priority unless there are good reasons for doing otherwise.)"
>
> [136 votes]

Regarding this as a vote of 183 in favour of the application of page priority in one manner or another—as against a vote of 136 in favour of the application of the rule of the first reviser, I referred to it in my paper as a 57 per cent. majority in favour of the application of page priority from January 1, 1954, onward (including those who chose to accept page priority as *always* binding).

In the belief that the mandate of our society had been clearly expressed, I thereupon undertook to state all the objections that I could find to Mr. Hemming's proposed return to the rule of the first reviser (see enclosed copy of MS., page 8).

I have now received from Dr. Michener the proposed report to Mr. Hemming on this vote, and I am greatly perturbed to find that, contrary to what had seemed obvious to me, the vote has been interpreted by our committee as a mandate in favour of return to the rule of the first reviser.

I am convinced that this must have been done by inadvertence, but lest I may have overlooked some element of the situation, I urge that you write me your views at once. Please express yourselves freely—there is no need for diplomacy on this occasion.

APPENDIX 2 TO MR. FOLLETT'S LETTER OF 27TH JULY 1952

Comments by members of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology on the questions raised in the Memorandum of 4th July, 1952 (reproduced in Appendix 1)

Enclosure 1 to Appendix 2 to Mr. Follett's letter

Letter, dated 8th July, 1952, from L. M. KLAUBER (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

I have read with interest the various items recently forwarded to me. I believe that the only one requiring comment is your letter of July 4th, addressed to the members of your committee, and in particular the last paragraph.

It seems to me that your view of the vote in adding the votes for items 1 and 2 together as being 183 votes in favour of page priority is the correct view to take, at least as far as the future is concerned. If it were not too cumbersome a procedure, an additional canvass inight be made requesting a choice between items 2 and 3, item 1 being eliminated, In other words, a decision as to whether page priority would be accepted for the future and the first reviser for the past, or the first reviser for the future as well as the past.

Enclosure 2 to Appendix 2 to Mr. Follett's letter

Extract from a letter, dated 15th July, 1952, from **ROBERT R. MILLER** (*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*)

First of all, I think you are absolutely correct in concluding that the vote on the recent SSZ ballot can only be interpreted as a vote in favour of the application of page priority in one way or another. Reeve agrees with you also. It would be interesting to see the actual breakdown by systematic disciplines of this vote. I wonder if most of those who favour the first reviser rule are not entomologists ?

Enclosure 3 to Appendix 2 to Mr. Follett's letter

Extract from a letter, dated 8th July, 1952, from

CURTIS W. SABROSKY

(*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology & Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

With reference to your several enclosures, I believe that the ballot on page priority could be interpreted both ways in part : Page priority was preferred *after January* 1, 1954 by a vote of 183 to 136, but note that when one looks at it the other way, the first reviser rule was preferred for names *before* that date by a vote of 240 to 79. In other words, the most impressive vote of the two was against the *retroactive* provision. Incidentally, our group here is planning to propose formally that the Paris action be reversed and that the rule of the first reviser be restored, with a strong recommendation for use of page priority except for good reason.

Incidentally, the size of the vote is a great disappointment. With scarcely over 300 members voting, I should hesitate to say, in cases where the vote was as divided as it was on page priority (183–136), that any " mandate " had been " clearly expressed " by our Society.

Another very disappointing thing is that 35 per cent. of the members indicated that they refused to adhere to the rule of the first reviser even when it was in effect. That is a sad commentary on how zoologists follow the rules.

Enclosure 4 to Appendix 2 to Mr. Follett's letter

Extract from a letter, dated 9th July, 1952, from **JOHN W. WELLS**
(*College of Arts and Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

I gather there is only one question that needs attention at present, from your memorandum of 4 July on Proposition VI. My interpretation of the votes on each of the three questions is that there is no clear mandate one way or the other, except that the largest single block of votes indicates a preference to follow the rule of the first reviser, a preference to which I would give the greatest weight, as being the most logical and sensible and the one which has the sanction of long usage. I certainly will not follow any other rule in my own work—for God's sake, let's keep the rule as simple as possible, subject to the least misinterpretation and admit of no exceptions, if we wish to achieve stability, which we certainly won't with the rules as they have been recently doctored.

APPENDIX 3 TO MR. FOLLETT'S LETTER 27TH JULY, 1952

Statement regarding a vote taken among the members of the Society of Systematic Zoology prepared by Professor CHARLES D. MICHENER, when Chairman of the Society's Nomenclature Committee

The Rule of the First Reviser *versus* Page Precedence

According to the rules currently in force, if an animal were named two or more times in the same book or paper, the first subsequent writer to recognise the synonymy (the first reviser) selected one of the names, which was thenceforth used. At the Paris (1948) meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature a retroactive decision was reached giving the first name priority (even if it appeared in the same line of print), thus making " page precedence " binding. (See *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 257–258, 328–331).

Part of the justification of this was the assertion that page precedence was being generally followed in spite of the rule of the first reviser. To gather data on this point, the following ballot was sent to members of the Society of Systematic Zoology.

Before the Paris Congress (*i.e.*, up to 1948), in deciding cases that involved synonyms published in the same work at the same time,

1. I adhered strictly to the first reviser rule.

2. I practiced " page precedence ", and, if necessary, rejected the name selected by the first reviser in order to adopt the name that appeared on an earlier page or line.

The results of the vote were as follows :

1. 138 (first reviser)

2. 75 (page precedence)

Another ballot, designed to determine what rule American taxonomists would prefer for the future, was sent to members of the Society, as follows :

1. I prefer to accept page precedence as always binding, both past and future, except in cases sufficiently important to warrant suspension of the rules.

2. I prefer to accept page precedence from January 1, 1954, onward, but in order to avoid changes in already well-established names, I would follow the first reviser for all cases in which such a reviser has acted before 1 January, 1954.

3. I prefer to follow the rule of the first reviser for the future as well as the past. (A strong recommendation could be added here, to the effect that a first reviser should follow page precedence unless there are good reasons for doing otherwise.

The results of the vote were as follows :

1. 79 (page precedence).

2. 104 (page precedence after January 1, 1954).

3. 136 (first reviser)

The Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology recommends that the decision with regard to page precedence reached at the Paris (1948) meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be reversed, and that instead the rule of the first reviser be written into the *Règles* with the strong recommendation that a first reviser should follow page precedence unless there is good reason for doing otherwise.

CHARLES D. MICHENER,

Chairman, Nomenclature Committee
Society of Systematic Zoology

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

CONTENTS

(*continued from front wrapper*)

Copenhagen Discussions : Cases 34–38

Page

Case No. 34 : Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision that a trivial name consisting of spelled-out letters or numerals shall not be accepted as available when those letters or numerals were originally employed as ordinals for the enumeration of the species, subspecies or infra-subspecific names concerned 355

Case No. 35 : Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision denying the status of availability to a trivial name inadvertently published as the result of the misreading of a previous publication or of a museum label or the like 357

Case No. 36 : Article 25 : proposed insertion of a provision that certain classes of generic names published for fossil species and bearing the termination " -ites ", " -ytes " or " -ythes " possess no status in zoological nomenclature 360

Case No. 37 : Article 25, Proviso (a) : proposed insertion of a provision that a trivial name having as its indication only a qualified reference to a previously published trivial name does not satisfy the requirements of the foregoing proviso 374

Case No. 38 : Article 38 : proposed restoration, in whole or in part, of the first reviser principle 376

Printed in England by Metcalfe & Cooper Limited, 10-24 Scrutton St., London E C 2

VOLUME 10. Part 13
Pp. 391—426

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

24th July, 1953

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS:

Copenhagen Discussions : Cases 39–52 Proposals relating to Article 30 (Cases 39–45), Article 31 (Cases 46–48), Article 32 (Case 49), and Articles 34 and 35 (Cases 50–52)

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1953

Price Fourteen Shillings

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Part 13 (pp. 391–426) 24th July, 1953

EDITORIAL NOTE

The Present Part contains Cases 39 to 52 arranged for discussion at Copenhagen.

Of the foregoing cases the first seven (Cases 39–45) are concerned with various aspects of Article 30 of the *Règles*. Case No. 39 raises a question as to the nominal species to be regarded in certain circumstances as included species and therefore as the species from which alone the type species of a given nominal genus can be selected. Case No. 40 is concerned with the clarification of the existing rules in relation to a nominal genus, the type species of which is alleged to have been based upon a misidentification. Case No. 41 contains a request for the clarification of Rule (c) (type species of monotypical genera). Cases Nos. 42 and 43 are concerned with various aspects of Rule (f) in Article 30, while Cases Nos. 44 and 45 contain requests for the clarification of Rule (g) in that Article.

Cases Nos. 46–48 seek to secure clarifications of, and improvements in, Article 31, in which the rules in Article 30 relating to the application of the names of nominal genera by the provision of type species are applied to the names of nominal species for the purpose of determining the application of those names through the selection of lectotypes.

Case No. 49 contains a request for the addition of a provision to Article 32 permitting the rejection of names on the ground of inappropriateness in certain specified circumstances.

Cases Nos. 50–52 are concerned to secure greater precision in the existing rules regarding the circumstances in which pairs of names are to be regarded as homonyms of one another.

CASE NO. 39

ARTICLE 30 : PROPOSED INSERTION OF A PROVISION CLARIFYING THE QUESTION OF THE NOMINAL SPECIES TO BE REGARDED AS ELIGIBLE FOR SELECTION AS THE TYPE SPECIES OF A GENUS ESTABLISHED WITHOUT CITED NOMINAL SPECIES, IN CASES WHERE A SUBSEQUENT AUTHOR, WITHOUT CITING SUCH A SPECIES, GIVES A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCE TO A WORK IN WHICH SUCH A SPECIES IS CITED

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)734)

DOCUMENT 39/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

REPORT ON THE ADOPTION OF A " DECLARATION " CLARIFYING THE POSITION REGARDING THE SPECIES TO BE REGARDED AS ELIGIBLE FOR SELECTION AS THE TYPE SPECIES OF A NOMINAL GENUS ESTABLISHED WITH NO CITED NOMINAL SPECIES

The question regarding the species to be regarded as eligible for selection as the type species of a nominal genus established without cited nominal species, in cases where a subsequent author, without citing such a species, gives a bibliographical reference to a work in which such a species is cited first arose in connection with Dr. L. R. Cox's application for a ruling as to the species to be accepted as the type species of the genus *Trigonia* Bruguière, 1789 (Class Pelecypoda) (Cox, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 79–84). As the issue so raised involved a question of principle, it fell, under the procedure prescribed in 1948, to be dealt with not by an *Opinion* but by an interpretative *Declaration*. In agreement with Dr. Cox, such a *Declaration* was asked for in a note by the Secretary published at the same time as Dr. Cox's application (Hemming, 1951, *ibid.* **6** : 85–88).

2. Terms of the " Declaration " voted upon by the International Commission : The following is the text of the proposed *Declaration* on which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature voted by post in 1952 :—

> In the case of a nominal genus established prior to 1st January, 1931, with an indication, definition or description but without citation of any nominal species, the citation by a later author in connection with the name of such a genus of a bibliographical reference to a book or paper containing the names of nominal species is not to be treated as constituting a distinct reference of the nominal species concerned to the genus in question, it being necessary for this purpose for an author explicitly to cite by name a nominal species as being referable to the genus in question.

3. Adoption on 22nd August, 1952 of a " Declaration " clarifying the position as regards the species to be regarded as eligible for selection as the type species of a nominal genus established without cited nominal species : The International Commission adopted on 22nd August, 1952 a *Declaration* on the foregoing subject in the terms of the draft set out in paragraph 2 above. Of the 18 members of the International Commission there voted in favour of the proposed *Declaration* the following 16 Commissioners (arranged in the order in which votes were received) : W. T. Calman ; E. M. Hering ; J. R. Dymond ; B. Hankó ; P. Bonnet ; H. E. Vokes ; J. Pearson ; J. C. Bradley ; A. do Amaral ; F. Hemming ; T. Esaki ; N. D. Riley ; H. Lemche ; N. R. Stoll ; H. Boschma ; A. Cabrera. No Commissioner voted against the proposed *Declaration.* No votes were received from two Commissioners (T. Jaczewski ; R. Mertens).

4. Submission of " Declaration " by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology : Under the procedure governing the rendering by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of *Declarations* interpreting the *Règles* an interpretation so given becomes operative immediately, but it is the duty of the International Commission to submit a *Declaration* so adopted to the next International Congress of Zoology for final approval. In accordance with the foregoing procedure, the *Declaration* set out in paragraph 2 of the present note adopted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by 16 votes (2 Commissioners not voting) is hereby submitted to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology for final approval.

CASE NO. 40

ARTICLE 30 : PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED IN DEALING WITH NOMINAL GENERA BASED, OR ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN BASED, UPON MISIDENTIFIED TYPE SPECIES

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)694)

DOCUMENT 40/1

By **J. CHESTER BRADLEY** (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

PROPOSAL FOR AN EMENDATION TO THE ACTION IN REGARD TO GENERA BASED UPON MISIDENTIFIED TYPE SPECIES TAKEN AT PARIS AND RECORDED ON PAGE 158 OF VOLUME 4 OF THE " BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE "

The following proposals grow out of the case of *Rasenia* Salfeld published in 1951 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 178–187).

Proposal (a)

The words (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 158, Conclusion 33, sub-conclusion (1), lines 3 and 4) " in the absence of evidence to the contrary " seem to negate the entire provision, for no one would suppose that an author had misidentified his material unless there was evidence to that effect. I therefore propose that these words be struck out.

Proposal (b)

I propose that the following words, or their equivalent, be added to the provision in question :—

> If an author when founding a new genus specifically states that he is basing the genus on, or interpreting the type-species in the sense of, a particular specimen or figure or description, then the species represented

by that specimen, figure or description becomes not only an originally included species, but also the type-species of the new genus, even though the author incorrectly applies some other specific name to it.

If, in such an instance, the specimen, figure or description concerned actually applies to a species that has never been named, then the author of the new genus shall be construed to have named that species under the homonym that he has applied to it, provided the requirements of Article 25 have been met. If they have not been met, the species concerned has the status of a manuscript species, and as such was not available for designation as type-species of the new genus. In that case the new genus is either one established without included species, or the type-species remains to be selected from among other originally included species.

Discussion : If an author wishes to establish a genus on a particular specimen to which he believes that an old name applies, but nevertheless recognises the possibility that the application of that old specific name might be challenged by other or future taxonomists, he is placed in somewhat of a dilemma. If he applies the old name to his material there is the possibility that at some future date his intent in erecting his new genus may be thwarted (under the present rule). If on the other hand he describes his material under a new name, he is deliberately creating what he believes to be a synonym of an older name, and this most taxonomists are quite properly loth to do. The purpose of the present proposal is to afford a precise procedure in such instances, which will protect the new genus in the sense intended by the author, without making it necessary to appeal each such case to the Commission for special action.

It is clear that in any such case coming under the proposed provision the author should publish in connection with the chosen taxonomic type-species sufficient data to validate it under Article 25, in case it should later prove to be different from the nominal species to which he assigns his material.

I am not completely convinced that the preceding proposal is the best method of handling this situation. The need for some clear procedure is evident, and either these proposals should be adopted or better ones formulated.

DOCUMENT 40/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

In Proposal (a) in the paper reproduced as Document 40/1 Professor Chester Bradley draws attention to what is undoubtedly a defect in the drafting of the conclusion reached in Paris (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 158) in regard to the preliminary assumption to be made as to the identity of a species designated, indicated or selected as the type species of a nominal genus, namely that the nominal species in question has been correctly identified by the original author of the generic name (by whom that nominal species was placed in the genus concerned) and/or by the later author by whom the nominal species in question was selected as the type species of that genus.

2. I entirely agree, therefore, with Professor Bradley that the words " in the absence of evidence to the contrary " should appear in lines 3 and 4 of the printed record of Conclusion 38(1) on page 158 of vol. 4 of the *Bulletin* are inappropriate and should be deleted. Merely to strike out these words would not, however, in my view, be satisfactory, for, although the words now proposed to be deleted were not well chosen, they were inserted with a purpose, namely to impose on sub-conclusion (1) (where the requirement to assume that nominal species referred to a given genus by its original author were correctly identified by him is imposed) the limitation contained in sub-conclusion (2) (where provision is made for dealing with the exceptional class of case where there is, it is claimed by taxonomists, ground for holding that the type species of a given nominal species was misidentified by the author who published the name of that genus). I therefore suggest that at the point where the words quoted above are deleted, there should be inserted the words " subject to the provisions of (2) below ".

CASE NO. 41

ARTICLE 30, PROPOSED CLARIFICATION OF RULE (C)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)732)

DOCUMENT 41/1

DR. ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY'S REQUEST FOR THE CLARIFICATION IN TWO RESPECTS OF THE RULES IN ARTICLE 30

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

The present application arises out of a paper regarding the species to be accepted as the type species of the nominal genus *Osleroides* Orlov, Davtian & Liubimov, 1933 (Class Nematoda, Order Rhabitida) which has been submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty as application No. Z.N.(S.)584, an application which it has not yet been possible to publish in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. The purpose of the present note is not to discuss the individual case submitted by Dr. Dougherty but to draw attention to the two questions of principle raised in that application, on which decisions are required before a decision can be taken on the question of the status of the foregoing generic name and of the species to be accepted as its type species.

2. The two questions of principle requiring answers may be summarised as follows :—

(1) Is a nominal genus to be treated as having been published as a monotypical genus for the purposes of Rule (c) in Article 30 if, on the first publication of the generic name in question, two or more nominal species are cited as belonging to the genus so named but only one of those nominal species possessed a trivial name validly published with an indication, definition or description ?

(2) If a nominal genus is established without a designated or indicated type species but is at the same time divided into two or more nominal subgenera and a type species is designated or indicated for the nominotypical subgenus, does that designation or, as the case may be, indication apply also to the nominal genus itself ?

3. During Dr. Dougherty's visit to London in September 1951, we discussed the questions so raised and agreed that on neither was there an explicit provision in the *Règles*, though, as regards each of these questions the provisions in the *Règles* were sufficient to provide a strong presumption as to the interpretation which should be adopted. Clearly, however, what is required in every case such as those now under consideration is an explicit and authoritative interpretation incorporated in the *Règles* themselves. Dr. Dougherty and I accordingly agreed that it was desirable that, concurrently with the publication of his application in regard to the name *Osleroides* (Z.N.(S.)584) there should be published a supplementary note setting out, for the consideration of zoologists, the drafts of the *Declarations* proposed to be adopted for the purpose of clearing up the two ambiguities to which Dr. Dougherty had drawn attention in the foregoing application. As regards the content of the proposed *Declarations*, I find myself in full agreement with the views expressed by Dr. Dougherty in his paper on the name *Osleroides*.

4. The problem raised in the first of the questions posed (Question (1) in paragraph 2 above) relates to a problem which (as all systematists know from experience) arises frequently in the case of names published before 1st January, 1931, and the answer suggested by Dr. Dougherty, namely that a nominal genus of the type in question should be treated as being monotypical, is that invariably assumed by systematists in respect of names published in the foregoing period. The situation with which we are here concerned would not have had any relevance prior to the Paris Congress of 1948 to a name published after 31st December, 1930, for in that period no generic published without an express type designation possessed any availability ; at the Paris Congress this provision was relaxed with retrospective effect (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 153). Accordingly, in this respect Rule (c) in Article 30, as applied to names published after 31st December, 1930, was put back into its pre-1931 position by the Paris Congress. The question on which an answer is now sought is therefore one in respect of all generic names irrespective of their date of publication.

5. The problem raised by the second of the two questions posed (Question (2) in paragraph 2 above) is one which is probably rare, but nevertheless an answer to it is required in order to determine the position of those names, such as *Osleroides*, for which it is, in the absence of an authoritative ruling, impossible to determine with certainty, the species to be accepted as the type species of the genus concerned. The course recommended by Dr. Dougherty is that any action taken under Article 30 for the designation (Rule (a)) or indication (Rule (c)) of the type species of the nominotypical subgenus of a nominal genus is to be treated as constituting also action taken in relation to the type species of the nominal genus itself.

6. At the time when Dr. Dougherty and I discussed this matter, it was hoped that it would be possible to publish the application relating to the name

Osleroides with an accompanying note raising the two questions discussed above in sufficient time to enable the International Commission to publish a *Declaration* on these questions for submission to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology at Copenhagen in 1953. For various reasons Dr. Dougherty found it necessary to revise part of his application relating to the name *Osleroides*, and by the time (March, 1952) that the text of that application had been finally settled, it was too late, having regard to other prior commitments, to publish it in sufficient time to enable the Commission to render and publish a *Declaration* on the questions discussed in this note before the Copenhagen Congress. The application relating to the name *Osleroides* will be published as soon as possible in the *Bulletin* but it has been judged desirable, in advance of the publication of that paper, to publish the present note in order to obtain decisions at Copenhagen on the two minor questions of principle involved.

7. **Suggestions submitted for consideration :** I accordingly now submit for consideration the following suggestions which were drawn up together by Dr. Dougherty and myself in September, 1951, when (as already explained) it was contemplated that the two questions involved should, in the first instance, be submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for action under the *Declarations* procedure.

Proposition 1

A nominal genus is to be treated as having been published with only one included nominal species and therefore as subject to Rule (c) in Article 30 (type species indicated by monotypy), where more than one nominal species was so cited, provided that one only of those nominal species possessed a trivial name validly published with an indication. Accordingly, the citation of unpublished manuscript names and/or of previously published *nomina nuda* is to be ignored in determining the number of nominal species originally included in any given nominal genus.

Proposition 2

Where an author, when establishing a nominal genus, omits to designate a type species for that genus but at the same time divides that nominal genus into two or more subgenera and either designates or indicates a type species for the nominotypical subgenus, that designation or, as the case may be, indication is to be treated as applying to the nominal genus itself as well as to its nominotypical subgenus.

CASE No. 42

ARTICLE 30, RULE (F) (RULE RELATING TO THE TYPE SPECIES OF A NOMINAL GENUS, THE NAME OF WHICH IS PUBLISHED TO REPLACE AN EARLIER NAME) : PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF WORDS TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THIS RULE APPLIES ONLY WHERE A NAME IS EXPRESSLY PUBLISHED AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ANOTHER NAME

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.) 539)

DOCUMENT 42/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

REPORT ON THE ADOPTION OF A " DECLARATION " MAKING IT CLEAR THAT RULE (F) IN ARTICLE 30 APPLIES ONLY TO CASES WHERE ONE GENERIC NAME IS EXPRESSLY PUBLISHED AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ANOTHER

The question whether, in order to come within the scope of Rule (f) in Article 30 the generic name in question must have been expressly published as a substitute name first came to notice in connection with an application relating to the type species of the genus *Fulgora* Linnaeus, 1767 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) submitted by Mr. R. G. Fennah (*Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture, Trinidad*) (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 34–44). As the issue so raised involved a question of principle, it fell, under the procedure prescribed in 1948, to be dealt with not by an *Opinion* but by a *Declaration*. A request for such a *Declaration* was accordingly made in a note by the Secretary published at the same time as Mr. Fennah's application (Hemming, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 45–48). Support for such a *Declaration* was received from Dr. Ernst Mayr (*American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 1952, *ibid.* **6** : 244) and from Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*).

2. **Terms of the " Declaration " voted upon by the International Commission :** The following is the text of the proposed *Declaration* on which

the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature voted by post in 1952 :—

> Rule (f) in Article 30 is to be interpreted (a) as though the words " expressly published " were inserted after the word " is " in place of the word " proposed ", and (b) as though the words " some specified generic name of older date " were substituted for the words " another generic name ". It is recommended that the foregoing changes be made in Rule (f) in Article 30 by the next International Congress of Zoology.

3. **Adoption on 15th August, 1952, of a " Declaration " making it clear that Rule (f) in Article 30 applies only to cases where a generic name is expressly published as a substitute name :** The International Commission adopted on 15th August, 1952, a *Declaration* on the foregoing subject in the terms of the draft set out in paragraph 2 above. Of the 18 members of the International Commission there voted in favour of the proposed *Declaration* the following 16 Commissioners (arranged in the order in which votes were received) : N. D. Riley ; E. M. Hering ; W. T. Calman ; J. R. Dymond ; B. Hankó ; P. Bonnet ; H. E. Vokes ; A. de Amaral ; J. Pearson ; J. C. Bradley ; F. Hemming ; T. Esaki ; H. Lemche ; A. Cabrera ; N. R. Stoll ; H. Boschma. No Commissioner voted against the proposed *Declaration*. No votes were received from two Commissioners (T. Jaczewski ; R. Mertens).

4. **Submission of " Declaration " by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology :** Under the procedure governing the rendering by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of *Declarations* interpreting the *Règles*, an interpretation so given becomes operative immediately, but it is the duty of the International Commission to submit a *Declaration* so adopted to the next International Congress of Zoology for final approval. In accordance with the foregoing procedure, the *Declaration* set out in paragraph 2 of the present note adopted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by 16 votes (two Commissioners not voting) is hereby submitted to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology for final approval.

CASE No. 43

ARTICLE 30, RULE (F) : PROPOSED CLARIFICATION OF THE POSITION AS REGARDS THE NOMINAL SPECIES ELIGIBLE TO BE THE TYPE SPECIES OF TWO NOMINAL GENERA, OF WHICH THE NAME OF ONE WAS PUBLISHED AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE OTHER

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)511)

DOCUMENT 43/1

By **ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY,** Ph.D., M.D.*
(*Department of Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*)

(Enclosure to a letter dated 5th July, 1951)

SUGGESTED EMENDATION OF ARTICLE 30, RULE (F) (RULE RELATING TO THE TYPE SPECIES OF TWO NOMINAL, OF WHICH ONE NAME IS PUBLISHED AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR AN EARLIER NAME)

In a recent paper (Dougherty, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 253–276), I pointed out (Section 4 (b)) that Article 30, Rule (f) has certain difficulties of application that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature does not appear to have recognised up to now. However, I did not specify what these were. It is the purpose of the present communication to enunciate the difficulties in question, and to recommend an emendation of Rule (f), so that they may be overcome.

2. In preliminary communication with Mr. Francis Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission, I received, through the kindness of Mr. Hemming, the text of a note proposing a certain clarification of Rule (f) (Hemming, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 37–44ϕ). I am in entire agreement with his recommendation. It does not, however, touch on the point with which I am concerned, and the present case may therefore be regarded as supplemental to his.

---

*Research Fellow of the American Cancer Society as recommended by the Committee of the National Research Council, 1949-52.

ϕSee Case No. 42.

3. Article 30, Rule (f), reads : " in case a generic name [= nominal genus] without originally designated type is proposed as a substitute for another generic name [= nominal genus], with or without type, the type of either, when established, becomes *ipso facto* type of the other ".

4. The crux of the problem is that, while Article 30, Rule (e) α, states that the " species which were not included under the generic name at the time of its original publication " are " excluded from consideration in determining the types of genera," Article 30, Rule (f), ostensibly provides a way in which this provision can be violated. Mr. Hemming has recommended clarification of the meaning of " proposed " in Rule (f) ; but, even if his recommendation is adopted, the following situation can arise. Let us suppose that an author Jones erected a genus A — with species A — x — and A — y — without designation of type. Later, Smith proposed genus B as a " substitute " for A — (in the strict sense that Mr. Hemming suggests) and included species B — z — and B — w — along with Jones's species. Now let us suppose either that Jones selected B — z — as type of B, or that he designated no type and that the first reviser, Brown, subsequently selected B — z— as type of B —. In either case, according to Article 30, Rule (f), B — z — " *ipso facto* " would become type of A —, *despite the fact that this was not an originally included species in A*. It seems to me that this is a situation that the framers of the *Règles* did not anticipate and would not have intended should arise.

5. *Opinions* 9, 35, and 148 involve the application of Article 30, Rule (f) but do not consider the problem posed in paragraph 4. Of these, only *Opinion* 9, explicitly refers to rule (f). This *Opinion* has been cancelled on the grounds that it gave no effective decision (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 335). *Opinion* 35 has been cancelled, except for historical purposes, and its decision amended and incorporated into the *Règles* (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 66, 155–156, 166) ; *Opinion* 148 has been similarly treated (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 147–148, 163, 164, 166). There appears to be no essential value in analysing these *Opinions* here.

6. I hereby recommend that, in order to bring Rule (f) into conformity with Rule (e) α and with the rest of Article 30 generally, Rule (f) be recast making it clear that the only species which can be the type species of what we may call a " substitute " genus (in Mr. Hemming's sense) is (1) the nominal species that is already the valid type species (by designation, indication, or selection) of the genus renamed, or (2) the nominal species designated, indicated, or selected for the substitute nominal genus, where the earlier nominal genus does not have a type species at the time the type for the substitute genus is so fixed and provided (and provided only) that the species so designated, indicated, or selected is one of the nominal species originally cited by the author of the earlier genus as belonging to that genus. (In other words, in the example given in paragraph 4, Jones or Brown must confine their choice of type of B to A — x — and A — y —, the only species originally included by Jones in A, the genus for which B was proposed by Smith as a " substitute " genus. In foregoing case (2) the species in question " *ipso facto* " also becomes type of the earlier genus. Where any other species is designated, indicated, or selected for such a " substitute" genus, the choice so made is invalid.

7. The International Commission is hereby petitioned to recommend the foregoing change in Article 30, Rule (f), to the next (Fourteenth) International Congress of Zoology.

8. The attention of the International Commission is also drawn to the fact that Rule (f) has implications for the problem of generic names first published in generic synonymies. The question as to how type species should be selected for nominal genera bearing such names is at present *sub judice* and the Secretary to the International Commission is to make a report on the subject to the next (Fourteenth) International Congress of Zoology (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 351–352). If it were to be decided that a generic name cited in a generic synonymy should be construed as a " substitute " for the earlier generic name in the sense of Rule (f), then such generic names could come under Article 30, Rule (f). It would seem to me that this would provide a reasonable solution to the problem now *sub judice*.

DOCUMENT 43/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

SUPPORT FOR Dr. ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY'S PROPOSAL FOR THE CLARIFYING OF THE POSITION AS TO THE NOMINAL SPECIES ELIGIBLE TO BE THE TYPE SPECIES OF NOMINAL GENERA UNDER RULE (F) IN ARTICLE 30, TOGETHER WITH A SUPPLEMENTARY PROPOSAL IN REGARD THERETO

I am in full agreement with Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty's proposal that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear what are the nominal species which are eligible, under Rule (f) in Article 30, to become the type species of any pair of nominal genera, of which the name of one is published as a substitute for that of the other. I should like, moreover, to take this opportunity of drawing attention to a decision taken in Paris in 1948 which, as I now think, was misconceived, and which will need to be revoked in any decision now to be taken to give effect to Dr. Dougherty's proposal.

2. The important question of the species which are to be regarded as having been originally included in any given nominal genus—a question on which the *Règles* had previously been silent—formed the subject of a decision in Paris which may be summarised by saying that the species in question are : (1) every nominal species cited under the genus by the author of the generic name (excluding, naturally, nominal species, the names of which had not been validly published or which did not satisfy the Provisos to Article 25), and (2) every nominal species, the name of which was cited as a synonym of any of the nominal species referred to in (1) above (see, 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl* **4** : 179–180, Conclusion 69 (3) (a)).

3. The Commission's *Opinion* 35—adopted at a time when it was considered that names published by authors who did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature (*i.e.*, authors who at that time were called "binary" authors) interpreted Rule (f) in Article 30 in such a way that a species not cited under a binominal name would be eligible to become the type species of a nominal genus. It was recognised in Paris that *Opinion* 35 was not consistent with the decision then taken that names were not to be accepted as possessing status under the Law of Priority unless in the book in which they were published the author concerned applied the principles of binominal nomenclature, and on this account certain drafting amendments were then made in the wording of that *Opinion* (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 66, Conclusion (3) (d)). Unfortunately, however, the fact that part of the actual ruling in *Opinion* 35 required amendment on the same grounds was overlooked when later the stage came to codify the decisions given in *Opinions* rendered up to 1948. In consequence, the following words found their way into the end of the decision then reached : " and that for this purpose it is not necessary that the species so selected should have been cited under a binominal name when originally cited either in the original genus or in the genus established in substitution therefor ".

4. I accordingly suggest that, as part of the decision giving effect to the proposal made by Dr. Dougherty in Document 43/1, it should be decided also to amend the decision quoted in paragraph 3 above by revoking the words quoted in the last sentence.

CASE No. 44

ARTICLE 30, RULE (G) : PROPOSED INSERTION OF WORDS TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THE SELECTION OF A GIVEN STRUCTURE EXHIBITED BY A SPECIMEN REFERRED TO A SPECIFIED NOMINAL SPECIES AS TYPICAL OF A GIVEN NOMINAL GENUS DOES NOT CONSTITUTE THE SELECTION OF THAT SPECIES AS THE TYPE SPECIES OF THAT GENUS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)735)

DOCUMENT 44/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

PROPOSED CLARIFICATION OF AN OBSCURITY IN RULE (G) IN ARTICLE 30

The subject matter of the present note came to light after the publication of Professor Harold E. Vokes' application in regard to the type species of the genus *Mytilus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pelecypoda) (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 31–32) and raises a question of principle which, at Professor Vokes' request, I now submit for decision.

2. The point may best be illustrated by citing the following particulars from the *Mytilus* case. This nominal genus was established by Linnaeus in 1758 with no type species ; among the included species were *M. anatinus* Linnaeus and *M. edulis* Linnaeus. The second of these species was selected as the type species of this genus by Anton (1839) and that selection has formed the basis of the concept of this genus by later authors. In 1817, however, Schumacher cited a " figure of the hinge of " *Anodonta anatina* (= *Mytilus anatinus* Linnaeus) as the type of the genus *Mytilus* Linnaeus. This selection, if accepted would have completely altered the concept represented by the generic name *Mytilus*, and it was to prevent the confusion resulting from this transfer that Professor Vokes in his application asked the International Commission to use its plenary powers to designate *M. edulis* Linnaeus as the type species of the genus *Mytilus*.

3. In a letter dated 22nd June, 1951 (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 339), Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) drew attention to the fact that Professor Vokes' application relating to the name *Mytilus* Linnaeus, 1758, was not the first occasion on which action taken by Schumacher (1817) in connection with the type species of genera had come before the International Commission, for a problem exactly similar to that raised in regard to the name *Mytilus* had arisen in the case of the type species of the genus *Arca* Linnaeus, 1758, which had been dealt with by the Commission in 1945 in its *Opinion* 189 (*Ops. Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 93–108). In that case also Schumacher had taken a morphological part (la charnière) of a specimen referred to a specified nominal species (*Arca antiguata* Linnaeus) as the " type du genre ". In the discussion on this case the view was expressed (:101) that Schumacher's action did not comply with the requirement in Rule (g) in Article 30 that the expression " select the type " is to be " rigidly construed " and attention was drawn to a comment by the late Dr. W. T. Calman (in a letter dated 12th February, 1943) that on the occasion in question Schumacher was clearly using the words " type " as the equivalent of " typical species " in the morphological or taxonomic sense, *i.e.*, that he was doing no more than observe that *A. antiquata* Linnaeus was the species in which the characters of the genus were most fully developed or clearly shown. It was argued, therefore, that Schumacher's action did not constitute the selection of *Arca antiquata* Linnaeus as the type species of the genus *Arca* Linnaeus. No express decision was taken in *Opinion* 189 on the question of the validity of Schumacher's action in relation to Rule (g) in Article 30, for his was not the only type selection (or alleged type selection) for the genus *Arca* made prior to the selection by Gray (J. E.) in 1847 of *Arca noae* Linnaeus, 1758, the species which it was the object of the applicant to secure as the legally valid type species of this genus. Accordingly, in granting this application, the Commission did no more than set aside under its plenary powers all type designations for the genus *Arca* Linnaeus made prior to the decision which it then took to designate *Arca noae* Linnaeus as the type species.

4. Thus, the status under Article 30 of the action of Schumacher (and any other author who may have acted in like manner) in stating that a specified structure exhibited by a given specimen referred to a given nominal species was the type of a given genus remained unsettled, although it had arisen directly during the consideration of *Opinion* 189. This could not have happened if in the year 1945 the revised procedure adopted in Paris had been in operation, for under that procedure the Commission was instructed in future to deal with all problems arising in connection with cases submitted to it (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 355), and, where an application raised an issue of principle to deal with it in an interpretative *Declaration* and not in the body of the *Opinion* devoted to the individual case concerned (1950, *ibid.* **4** : 137). At Paris an attempt was made to deal with—by incorporation into the *Règles* or otherwise—all questions of principle which had arisen in connection with *Opinions* already rendered by the Commission, but it was realised that, although a careful search of the *Opinions* had been made from this point of view, it was likely that some problems of a general character had been overlooked ; accordingly an appeal

was made to zoologists to bring to the attention of the Commission any cases of this sort which they might detect (1950, *ibid.* **4** : 136, Conclusion 9 (1) (c)). The present application by Professor Vokes and myself is accordingly made in response to the foregoing invitation.

5. Immediately upon its receipt, I communicated Mr. Baily's note to Professor Vokes who, in replying (on 30th July, 1951) expressed the view that the proper course would be to ask the Commission to render a *Declaration* in general terms which would make it clear that action such as that taken by Schumacher in 1817 (in relation to the nominal genera *Mytilus* Linnaeus and *Arca* Linnaeus) did not constitute a valid type selection under Rule (g) in Article 30. The proposal which we now submit is, therefore, that words should be added to Rule (g) in Article 30 to the following effect ; " Where an author specifies a particular structure exhibited by a specimen referred to a specified nominal species as the type of a given nominal genus, that action does not constitute a selection, as the type species of the genus concerned, of the nominal species to which the specimen in question was so referred ".

CASE No. 45

ARTICLE 30 : PROPOSED REPEAL OF THE PORTION OF RULE (G) ARISING FROM THE INTERPRETATION IN " OPINION " 6

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)504)

DOCUMENT 45/1

By **WILLIAM GOSLINE** (*University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii*)

Extract from a letter, dated 21st November, 1950

I have another suggestion for the simplification of the revised Rules. That is that subsequent generic restriction be eliminated as a factor in the subsequent designation of certain genotypes ; in short that *Opinion* 6 and possibly others that I have missed be eliminated.

If *Opinion* 6 is maintained, I become involved in the following type of problem.

Ophisurus was described by Lacépède (1800, vol. 2, p. 195) with two included species, *O. ophis* (Linnaeus) and *O. serpens* (Linnaeus). No type was designated.

In 1810 Rafinesque described the genus and species *Oxystomus hyalinus*. This species is said to be a synonym of *Ophisurus serpens* of Lacépède. Does this constitute fixation of the genotype of *Ophisurus* as *Ophisurus ophis* under *Opinion* 6 ? If not, then Risso (1826), Swainson (1838), and Kaup (1856) have also tried to restrict the genus *Ophisurus* to one of Lacépède's species or the other. But whether any of these authors can be said to have met the exact requirements of *Opinion* 6 is doubtful. Finally Bleeker (1846) designated a genotype.

Now, the questions in my mind are two : (1) how strictly is *Opinion* 6 to be interpreted, and (2) why would it not be better to eliminate *Opinion* 6 and the problems it raises ? As to the second question, I feel that, for certain genotypes, *Opinion* 6 brings in a lot of extraneous factors for consideration that improve nothing and merely complicate matters. As you have pointed out, people have interpreted *Opinion* 6 as applying to genera with more than two originally included species. If this was not the intention of the Commissioners, then why *Opinion* 6 ? The special case they take up there is certainly not worth forming an exception for in itself. I am inclined to feel that instead of interpreting *Opinion* 6 as a special case as you have done, it would be better to discard this *Opinion* completely. (Any changes of genotype that would be caused by the elimination of *Opinion* 6 at this late date could be taken care of by the Plenary powers of the Commission.)

DOCUMENT 45/2

Proposal by **J. CHESTER BRADLEY** (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

Note by the Secretary : Attention is drawn to the fact that in a paper which was primarily concerned with the question of Article 31 and which has therefore been included in the Series of papers dealing with that subject, in which it appears as Document 46/1, Professor J. Chester Bradley has also proposed that the Ruling on the interpretation in Rule (g) in Article 30 introduced by the Commission's *Opinion* 6 should be repealed.

2. *Opinion* 6 itself has already been repealed, except for historical purposes (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 165–166), the substance of the ruling given it having been incorporated into the *Règles* in 1948 (1950, *ibid.* 4 : 157, Conclusion 36). The action which would be required to give effect to the proposal submitted by Dr. Gosline would, therefore, be the repeal of Conclusion 36 of the Sixth Meeting of the International Commission during its Paris Session, as subsequently approved by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology. (Intl'd.) F. H., 15th June, 1953.

CASE No. 46

ARTICLE 31 : PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO NOMINAL SPECIES SUBJECTIVELY REGARDED BY TAXONOMISTS AS COMPOSITE SPECIES

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)698)

DOCUMENT 46/1

By **J. CHESTER BRADLEY** (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

ARTICLE 31, AS AMENDED IN 1948

Proposal received on 26th July, 1952

An objectionable feature of the old Article 31 has been carried through into the amended Article. It is a reference to a " composite species " and to the " division of a species ". These unfortunate phrases can give rise or misapprehension, and to illogical concepts.

At Paris we defined " specific name " and we defined " subspecies ". The latter definition applies only to a taxonomic concept of a subspecies. We did not define a species. We could define a nominal species or subspecies (strictly for the purposes of nomenclature) in the following manner :

A nominal species (or subspecies) is objectively the type specimen (holotype, lectotype, or neotype) which determines the application of the trivial name originally applied to it, plus subjectively all other individual organisms that any given author considers are conspecific (or consubspecific).

A taxonomic species or subspecies (from the standpoint of nomenclature*) consists objectively of a nominal species that, in the view of any given author, has no senior synonym, plus, subjectively, all those nominal species or subspecies that are, in his view junior synonyms of it.

Under these definitions the type, the nucleus, the definitive feature of every species, nominal or taxonomic, is objectively established, but the contents, the limits that it embraces are purely subjective and subject to constant fluctuation.

---

*These will not serve as biological definitions, which would involve a population centering around a norm that may be very different from the type specimen.

There can be no such thing as an objective composite species. The objective nominal species is the type above. The type plus the other specimens that the founder of a species included in it *were* the species, subjectively, to him, and come completely within the above definitions, either as a nominal or a taxonomic species. To him it was *not* composite. It only becomes subjectively composite in the view of some later author when and if that author decides that some originally included specimens are not truly co-specific.

What Article 31 really means to say then, is that in case, after a species is founded, some subsequent author subjectively considers that one or more of the specimens originally subjectively associated with the objective nominal species (*i.e.*, the holotype) were incorrectly included in the species, he is to act under certain principles in removing them.

The question then arises : Suppose that when the species in question was established, no holotype was selected, could it not then have been composite, since the syntypes were on equal footing ? Or if it was established on the basis of figures, was it not composite if those figures depicted different species ?

The answer is " No." The species theoretically only had objective existence from the moment that it acquired a type and hence became objectively definable. If it had a holotype from the outset, well and good ; if not, it was defective, capable only of subjective interpretation until it acquired a lectotype or shall acquire a neotype.

When a lectotype (or neotype) is finally established, its significance is projected backward to the date when the species was established. It becomes the objective definitive factor as from the beginning, and any *ad interim* subjective interpretations that do not conform must be quashed. Otherwise as a type it would either be without meaning, or we should have to revise the Law of Priority by providing that a species dates from the time when it is given a definitive factor, *i.e.*, a holotype. That we could not do—yet it probably would be a wise requirement for the future.

How does all this actually affect the provisions of Article 31 ?

Let us assume a species " z " based on five original specimens, " a ", " b ", " c ", " d ", and " e ". No holotype having been designated, each of these five have equal value as syntypes, but no one has definitive value. The species at that time is not capable of objective interpretation. Author No. 2 observes that specimens " d " and " e " are not specifically identical with " a ", " b " and " c " and erects for them species " x ". He has in effect divided the subjective species " z ", which author No. 1 did not consider to be composite, into two species because he, subjectively, considers that it was composite. (Note that whether or not it was composite is purely subjective, hence a matter of taxonomic judgement, and therefore not an appropriate condition to include in Article 31.) We now have :

Opinion of author 1.	Species z comprises specimens a, b, c, d, e.
Opinion of author 2.	Species z comprises specimens a, b and c. Species x comprises specimens d and e.

When author No. 3 wishes to give species z objective reality by establishing a lectotype for it, he is confronted with the question as to whether he is restricted in his choice to specimens " a ", " b ", and " c ". In other words, is he to apply in selecting the type-specimen the principle of elimination which has been discarded from practice in selecting type species of genera ? It is clear that the revision made in 1948 in Conclusion 11(2) of the Commission's Fourth Meeting (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 74–76) does not contemplate such restriction. He is free to choose a lectotype from any of the five original specimens.

There was very good reason for this : The original wording, even of very ancient descriptions, often was clearly based on a particular specimen identifiable by some individual characteristic, such as a peculiar arrangement of spotting, a broken part, or something else. Furthermore other specimens may be definitely excluded by referring to them as variants, or varieties, or in some other manner. In the example that we have been considering, let us suppose either that " a ", " b " and " c " are in this manner definitely excluded as being any one of them the specimen on which the species was based, or that specimen " e " is the only specimen that the original description could have applied to. In either case it would be wrong to exclude " d " and " e " from becoming lectotypes, or to require that the lectotype be chosen from " a "," b ", or " c ".

To that extent the action taken at Paris in 1948 was logical and correct, but we went one step further and in doing so clearly stumbled. The ruling adopted by the Commission in its ruling (2) (e) in its Conclusion 11 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 76) provides, in effect, that if there are only two original specimens the selection of either as holotype of a new species automatically establishes the other as lectotype of the first. For precisely the reasons given above this is an improper regulation and should be rescinded. It could very easily result in forcing the lectotype to be a specimen that the author clearly excluded as being the specimen on which his species was based.*

In effect then, I would think that Article 31 (as applied to species) would be improved if it were to accord with the following :

---

*This provision was doubtless introduced on analogy with the principle applied to type-species of genera by the old *Opinion* 6. However, the cases are different, since in one case it is an individual specimen, in the other a species that is in concern. Furthermore, *Opinion* 6 seems to have been an unnecessary and unfortunate decision. It re-introduced to its limited extent the thoroughly discredited principle of type selection by elimination, and is equally open to the objection that the latter of two species remaining in the genus is apt to be there because it was unrecognisable, or at least the most poorly known. I would think the provision might well be rescinded, with the exception that no decisions that have already been made based on it should be disturbed.

(a) When a nominal but subjectively defined species is subjectively considered by any author to include specimens of more than one taxonomic species among its syntypes, he is at liberty (*a*) in the first place to establish the species on an objective basis by selecting for it a lectotype, or under appropriate circumstances a neotype, and (*b*) in the second place to remove any or all of the other specimens previously constituting syntypes to other species, whether previously established or previously unknown. In the latter case they may, where desirable, become holotypes or paratypes of their respective species.

(b) When a nominal species is originally objectively defined, that is to say provided with a holotype, any other specimens, even though designated as paratypes, are only subjectively associated with that nominal species. It is open to any subsequent author who subjectively considers that the original author erred in subjectively associating them or any of them, specifically with the holotype to remove them, or any of them, to other species, and if need be to make them types of new species.

It goes without saying that the original trivial name is defined by the lectotype or holotype as the case may be.

CASE No. 47

ARTICLE 31 : PROPOSED REFINEMENT OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO LECTOTYPES

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)699)

DOCUMENT 47/1

By **J. CHESTER BRADLEY** (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

LECTOTYPES : A PARAGRAPH IN THE " RÈGLES " THAT NEEDS SOME QUALIFICATION

Proposal received on 26th July, 1952

In 1948 it was decided (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 76, Conclusion 11(2) (d)), in effect, that, where a nominal species is based upon only two (2) syntypes and there has been no published lectotype selection, the establishing of either specimen as the holotype of another nominal species is automatically to be construed as fixing the other specimen as the type—the word used should have been " lectotype " of the first nominal species.

Suppose specimens " a " and " b " are of species " albus ". Syntype " a " agrees with the description, syntype " b " does not. If the later author makes syntype " a " type of his new species, " arcticus," then it would be improper to re-interpret the original species " albus " by making " b " its lectotype. In such case the second species " arcticus " should become an objective synonym of the first " albus ". The case is still stronger if the original describer clearly described or referred to syntype " b " as a varient or variety.

Would it not be better to modify the regulation by terminating it as follows : " This act shall be construed as presumptive fixation of the other specimen as the lectotype of the first nominal species. It shall nevertheless be open to a subsequent author to establish the one specimen not only as holotype of the second species but also as lectotype of the first in case he discovers that the other specimen was referred to by the original author as a variety or variant, or definitely excluded from having been the actual type by wording of the description, including such subordinate data as locality, collector, date, or location of the specimen, while at the same time the holotype of the later species is not so excluded ".

It would be obviously improper, if two taxonomic species are involved in the two syntypes, for the name to be transferred to the one that the original author specifically excluded by referring to it as a variant. If, without in so many words selecting either as holotype, the author stated " This species was collected at " X " by Mr. " B " on such and such a day and is in the collection of the " Z " institute ; I have also seen a specimen collected at " Y " in the " W " Museum then it would be equally improper and contrary to fact for an action of a later author to be construed as making the specimen in "W" Museum the lectotype.

Finality of selection of a lectotype. Shall the selection of a lectotype hold, regardless of all considerations ? Is it not necessary to add a provision on this matter ?

Would it not be wise to provide that no selection of a lectotype shall be valid, if it is proven that the specimen so selected was definitely rejected by the original author as not being typical (*i.e.*, was referred to as a variant or variety) or if it definitely disagrees with the description, while other syntypes do agree with it, or was clearly excluded from consideration by the original author (as, ex. gr., by some such specification of data as suggested in the second paragraph preceding), or if it is proven that the supposed lectotype was not an original syntype ?

Perhaps also a provision should be added to the effect that, except on the grounds of such false selection as I have above described, when an author has both published the fact that he has selected a lectotype, with statement as to where it is located, and described the specimen and its labelling in such manner that it can be positively recognised by other workers, that neither he nor any other author is at liberty subsequently to change its status. Provision to empower the Commission to review the question and decide, would care for the occasional case where a serious blunder has been made, the effects of which would be upsetting to stability.

DOCUMENT 47/2

By **RICHARD MEINERTZHAGEN**, D.S.O. (*London*)

Extract from a letter dated 16th June, 1952

What about that abominable practice, especially favoured by Mathews and often used by Linnaeus, of making a coloured plate (I refer only to Aves) the type. Plates seldom reflect accurate colours and with age, fade or " fox ". Moreover in the same edition of a book, the tint of a colour often varies. I should insist on a specimen (in Aves) being the type. I believe the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature do not recognise plates as types; but in insects—*e.g.*, Mallophaga, an accurate drawing is often more important than the written description.

It was most unfortunate that Linnaeus lived at Uppsala, which is a district intermediate between the north European and central European races of several birds. Both the Finnish and West European races of the Magpie occur at Uppsala and Linnaeus' description fits both; the same with the starling. This is a clear case where a neotype is desirable. In such cases full reason for making a neotype should be given. There is a danger of a man like " B " going through some old literature on birds from some particular area and, where no types exist, making a hundred neotypes and placing them in the local museum.

CASE No. 48

ARTICLE 31 : SUGGESTED DRAFTING AMENDMENTS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)743)

DOCUMENT 48/1

By **J. CHESTER BRADLEY** (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE 31

Proposal received on 5th August, 1952

I propose that the several parts of Article 31 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 74–76, Conclusion 11 ; *ibid.* **4** : 152, Conclusion 26) be revoked, the following provisions being inserted in their place.

(1) Sub-section (a) on page 74 to be cancelled and replaced with the following provisions :—

(a) A nominal species based on syntypes or without types is subjectively defined.

(b) A nominal species cannot be objectively defined until and unless it possesses a holotype, lectotype or neotype and then exclusively by the characters of such type.

(c) When a species originally possesses a holotype, or subsequently a lectotype, any other specimens, even though designated paratypes, are only subjectively associated with it.

(d) Any author is at liberty to establish a subjective nominal species on an objective basis by selecting a lectotype for it.

(e) Any author who subjectively considers that the holotype and paratypes or the syntypes of a nominal species comprise more than one taxonomic species is at liberty to remove any of them, except the holotype, lectotype or neotype to other species. If such species are undescribed they may become its types.

(f) In cases where no type material exists, but the original description, or illustration, or accepted tradition (as, ex. gr., in the case of the human species) sufficiently satisfy all taxonomists to the extent that they require no more objective definition, the case may rest undisturbed.

(2) Sub-section (b) on page 75 to be cancelled and replaced with the following provisions :—

Holotype and lectotype shall be determined according to the following rules :

(i) If the species when described was stated to be or is known to have been based upon a single specimen, that specimen is the holotype.

(ii) If the author when describing the species designated one and only one specimen to be " the type " or its equivalent that specimen is the holotype. If, in default of publishing such a designation, he is known to have labelled one and only one specimen as "type" or its equivalent that specimen is the holotype.

(iii) If no holotype was originally indicated under rules (i) and (ii) above, the type specimens are all " syntypes " (see definition) whether so labelled, or labelled " cotypes ", or " types ", or otherwise or not labelled, but excluding all specimens originally referred to as variants, varieties, or doubtfully included, or deliberately omitted from inclusion among the types, even though recorded in the original publication.

(iv) When there was no holotype, any author may select any one of the syntypes to be the lectotype, provided that syntype does not disagree with the original description in some point with which another syntype does agree, and is not one clearly excluded by the original author by reason of sex, form, stage, locality, date of capture, or in any other way.

(v) When an author thus selects a lectotype and publishes his selection, stating where it is located and by what labelling and individual characteristics (if any) it may be recognised, that specimen is the lectotype and its status is not subject to subsequent change, except by act of the Commission, or on grounds of false selection (*i.e.*, contravention of the provisions under (iv) above.

(3) Sub-paragraph (c) on page 75 :
To be cancelled because included as (2) (i) above.

(4) Sub-paragraph (d) on page 76 :
To be cancelled because included under (2) (iii) above.

(5) Sub-paragraph (e) on page 76 :
To be cancelled because included as a *Recommandation* below.

(6) Sub-paragraph (f) on page 76 :

To be cancelled and replaced with the following :

> The fact that a specimen is a syntype or a paratype of one nominal species does not prevent it from being designated holotype, lectotype, syntype, or paratype of another.

(7) Sub-paragraph (g) on page 76 :

To be cancelled ; the matter to be replaced with new provisions for neotypes.

(8) Sub-paragraph (h) on page 76 :

To be cancelled, the procedure that it covers being fully included in the preceding provisions.

(9) To add the following :–

Recommendation : When a species is based on two or more syntypes, one of which is subsequently designated holotype of a new species, the other becomes presumptive lectotype of the earlier species. Therefore, in fixing a lectotype, the selector should designate that syntype to be the lectotype, unless, in his view, it is not suitable to serve or unless usage would be better maintained by making the first syntype, now holotype of the later species, also lectotype of the earlier one.

ANNEXE TO DOCUMENT 48/1

Suggested Amendments to the New Article or part of Article 31 agreed upon at Paris and recorded on pages 186–188 of Volume 4 of the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature "

(1) That in the definition of lectotype, the clause explaining how lectotype selection becomes effective be removed from the definition and incorporated elsewhere (see proposal for amending Article 31 (2) (v)).

(2) That a provision be added to the effect that when there occurs an erroneous statement in the original description, or a statement apparently intended to apply to specimens subjectively associated with the holotype or lectotype but not to latter, the actual characters of the holotype or lectotype shall nevertheless be the criteria for determining the taxonomic unit to which the trivial name applies.

CASE No. 49

ARTICLE 32 : PROPOSED INSERTION OF A PROVISION FOR THE REJECTION OF A NAME ON THE GROUND OF INAPPROPRIATENESS IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S)723)

DOCUMENT 49/1

By **G. H. E. HOPKINS,** O.B.E., M.A. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *The Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts, England*)

Letter dated 14th July, 1951

On p. 115 of vol. 3 of *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* there was published a proposal that totally misleading trivial names might be suppressed by the Commission. This (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 289) was rejected on the grounds (so far as I can see) that it might lead to numerous requests for changes as a result of changes in the status of countries or parts of countries or changes in the names by which countries were known.

Now I agree that it would be most undesirable that changes should be permitted on such grounds, and the proposer brought this aspect of the question to the fore by citing as an example of a name he wanted changed, the name *britannicus* for the Irish subspecies of *Pieris napi*, although even the most extreme Irish nationalist cannot prevent Ireland being part of the British Isles. But I think that, with one precaution, the suggestion should be reconsidered, the precaution being that, for a suggested rejection to be considered by the Commission, it must be shown that the name was incorrect *at the time it was given*. That would entirely rule out the numerous requests that the Commission feared, and reduce the number of possible cases to a small number in which the name is (and always was) an absurdity. This is a point on which I feel pretty strongly, for I wasted days, weeks and months in Samoa hunting for *Catochrysops samoa*, only to find after I got back to England that apparently the only reason the author had for giving it that name was that the entire type series was captured in Fiji ! Another completely absurd one (and I really believe that these cases do harm by bringing nomenclature into disrepute) is *Mustela africana*, which is an American species.

Could this matter be reconsidered by the Commission at a convenient time, please ?

CASE No. 50

ARTICLES 34 AND 35 : PROPOSED ADDITION OF THE CONSONANTAL " I " AND THE CONSONANTAL " J " AND " YI " AS FORMING A GROUP OF IDENTICAL LETTERS FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE LAW OF HOMONYMY

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)411)

DOCUMENT 50/1

By **HOBART M. SMITH**
(*University of Illinois, Department of Zoology, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

Enclosure to a letter dated 16th March, 1949

PROPOSAL OF HOMONYMY WITH THE CONSONANTAL " I " AT THE CONSONANTAL LETTERS " J " AND " YI "

Pertinent sections of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (Articles 35 and 36, and Article 34 as modified by *Opinion* 147) require consideration of each of the following as separate names : *Tapaja* Oken (*Lacerta orbicularis* Linnaeus (by present designation) ; *Tapayia* Gray (Ann. Philos., n.s., vol. 26, 1825, p. 197), type *Lacerta orbicularis* Linnaeus (by monotypy) ; and *Tapaya* Fitzinger (Nene Classification der Reptilien, 1826, pp. 17, 49), type *Lacerta orbicularis* Linnaeus by subsequent designation. There is no evidence that any one of these names was based upon the other ; no reference is made in any case to previous use of the names by other authors, and instead in each the author claims the name, by statement or implication, as original with him.

Inasmuch as the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature did, at the Paris meeting in 1948, recommend consideration as homonyms those generic names differing only in the consonantal letters *i*, *y*, *ei*, *ej*, and *ij*, a logical course is indicated for the present case. With the recommendation of Secretary Francis Hemming I suggest that the consonantal letters *j* and *yi* be added to the preceding list, thus rendering the three names cited homonyms.

CASE No. 51

ARTICLES 34 AND 35 : QUESTION WHETHER TWO NAMES CONSISTING OF WORDS DIFFERING FROM ONE ANOTHER IN SPELLING ONLY BY THE PRESENCE IN THE ONE CASE AND BY THE ABSENCE IN THE OTHER, OF A DIACRITIC MARK OVER (OR UNDER) ONE OF THE LETTERS OF THE WORD OF WHICH THE NAMES ARE COMPOSED ARE TO BE TREATED AS HOMONYMS OF ONE ANOTHER

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)538)

DOCUMENT 51/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

Dr. HELEN MUIR-WOOD'S REQUEST FOR A CLARIFICATION OF THE PROVISIONS IN ARTICLE 20 RELATING TO THE USE OF DIACRITIC MARKS IN RELATION TO THE LAW OF HOMONYMY

The question whether two names differing from one another in spelling only by the presence, in the one case, and by the absence, in the other case, of a diacritic mark over one of the letters of which the word is comprised are to be treated as homonyms of one another has been raised by Dr. Helen Muir-Wood. The publication of her application (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 92–94) elicited a considerable amount of comments from various quarters. Among these comments there was a proposal that Article 20 should be amended in such a way as to exclude diacritic marks from its scope. If this proposal were to be approved, it would dispose entirely of Dr. Muir-Wood's proposal, which would cease to have any relevance. Clearly therefore the first thing to be done in this matter is to obtain a decision on the proposal that diacritic marks should no longer be used in the writing of scientific names. Accordingly, this major question has been put forward under Article 20, where it figures as Case No. 20.

2. Naturally, the comments received in relation to Dr. Muir-Wood's application throw light on the attitude of the specialists concerned in regard to the broader question whether the requirement that diacritic marks should be used should be dispensed with. Accordingly, the whole of the documentation received on the subject of diacritic marks has been included among the documentation relating to the foregoing question (Case No. 20).

3. Most of the specialists who have commented upon Dr. Muir-Wood's proposal—and whose comments are given under Case No. 20 or are there referred to—are in favour of treating as distinct any names which differ from one another only by the presence or the absence of a diacritic mark. It is necessary, therefore, to consider the position which would arise in the event of the rejection of the proposal (Document 20/4) that the reference to diacritic marks should be deleted from Article 20. Accordingly, attention is drawn to the fact that the whole of the documentation relating to the relationship of Article 20 to Articles 34 and 35 has included under, or referred to under, Case No. 20—the case dealing with the broader issues referred to above. It may be convenient, however, at this point to provide the following brief summary :—

(a) Authors who take the view that the presence over (or under) a letter comprised in a word published as a scientific name constitutes a difference in spelling, when that name is compared with another name consisting of an otherwise identical word, no letter of which bears a diacritic mark, and therefore that such names are not homonyms of one another :

  (1) Dr. C. J. Stubblefield (*London*);
  (2) Professor E. M. Hering (*Berlin*) ;
  (3) Professor Leif Størmer (*Oslo*) ;
  (4) Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) ;
  (5) Dr. Ernst Mayr (*New York*) ;
  (6) Professor Raymond C. Moore (*Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*).

(b) Authors who consider that names of the type referred to in (a) above should be treated as homonyms of one another :

  (1) The Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America (by a majority of eight to three) ;
  (2) Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*);
  (3) Dr. K. H. L. Key (*Canberra, Australia*) ;
  (4) Dr. Henning Lemche (*Copenhagen*) ;
  (5) Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, D.C. ;
  (6) Dr. J. Marvin Weller (*Chicago*) ;
  (7) Professor Rudolf Richter (*Frankfurt a.M.*) ;
  (8) American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature.

CASE No. 52

ARTICLES 34 AND 35 : PROPOSED CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF, IN RELATION TO NAMES DIFFERING FROM ONE ANOTHER ONLY THROUGH THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF DIACRITIC MARKS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)540)

DOCUMENT 51/1

Proposal by **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

Attention is drawn to a note on the subject of Articles 34 and 35 in relation to names differing from one another in spelling through the presence, or absence, of a diacritic mark over (or under) one of the letters of the words of which the names in question are composed which I wrote at the time of the publication of Dr. Helen Muir-Wood's request for a ruling whether such names are to be regarded as homonyms of one another. This note was written on the assumption—no proposal to the contrary then having been made—that the existing reference to diacritic marks would be retained in Article 20. Since thate date—as has already been explained—a proposal has been received that the requirement in Article 20 that diacritic marks are to be retained should be repealed. This proposal is dealt with in the present series of papers as Case No. 20. If that proposal were to be approved, the first of the two questions dealt with in the present case would cease to have any practical importance.

2. In the paper referred to above (Hemming, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 94–96), I made two suggestions of a drafting character designed to give a categorical answer to questions which at various times I had received as to the meaning of Article 20. These suggestions were :—

(1) that words should be inserted to make it clear that the rules (adopted in Paris) relating to the automatic correction of breaches of the provisions of Article 20 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 67–68) relate only to cases where a diacritic mark which appeared in the patronymic upon which a given name is based is incorrectly omitted on the latinisation of that word for the purpose of forming a scientific name (whether a generic name or a trivial name) ;

(2) that the relevant portion of Article 20 should be redrafted in order to make it clearer that this Article does prescribe any particular method for indicating the presence of a diacritic mark, it being left to the discretion of authors (for example) either to use an umlaut or alternatively to insert the letter "e" after the vowel concerned, though (as recommended by the Boston Congress of 1907) the latter method is recommended.

3. At the same time attention is drawn to a suggestion since received from Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 254) that the second of the two methods for indicating an umlaut (*i.e.*, that recommended by the Boston Congress should be rendered mandatory. Attention is invited also to the similar proposal more recently received from Professor Richter (*Frankfurt a.M.*) (for the text of which see pp. 90–100 of the present volume).

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

CONTENTS

(continued from front wrapper)

Copenhagen Discussions : Cases 39–52

Page

Case No. 39 : Article 30 : proposed insertion of a provision clarifying the question of the nominal species to be regarded as eligible for selection as the type species of a genus established without cited nominal species, in cases where a subsequent author, without citing such a species, gives a bibliographical reference to a work in which such a species is cited 392

Case No. 40 : Article 30 : proposed amendment of the provisions relating to the procedure to be followed in dealing with nominal genera based, or alleged to have been based, upon misidentified type species 394

Case No. 41 : Article 30 : proposed clarification of Rule (c) 397

Case No. 42 : Article 30, Rule (f) (Rule relating to the type species of a nominal genus, the name of which is published to replace an earlier name) : proposed introduction of words to make it clear that the Rule applies only where a name is expressly published as a substitute for another name 400

Case No. 43 : Article 30, Rule (f) : proposed clarification of the position as regards the nominal species eligible to be the type species of two nominal genera, of which the name of one was published as a substitute for the other 402

Case No. 44 : Article 30, Rule (g) : proposed insertion of words to make it clear that the selection of a given structure exhibited by a specimen referred to a specified nominal species as typical of a given nominal genus does not constitute the selection of that species as the type species of that genus 406

Case No. 45 : Article 30 : proposed repeal of the portion of Rule (g) arising from the interpretation in " Opinion " 6 409

Case No. 46 : Article 31 : proposed amendment of provisions relating to nominal species subjectively regarded by taxonomists as composite species 411

Case No. 47 : Article 31 : proposed refinement of provisions relating to lectotypes 415

Case No. 48 : Article 31 : suggested drafting amendments 418

Case No. 49 : Article 32 : proposed insertion of a provision for the rejection of a name on the ground of inappropriateness in certain circumstances 421

Case No. 50 : Articles 34 and 35 : proposed addition of the consonantal " i " and the consonantal " j " and " yi " as forming a group of identical letters for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy 422

Case No. 51 : Articles 34 and 35 : question whether two names consisting of words differing from one another in spelling only by the presence in the one case and by the absence in the other, of a diacritic mark over (or under) one of the letters of the word of which the names are composed are to be treated as homonyms of one another 423

Case No. 52 : Articles 34 and 35 : proposed clarification of certain aspects of, in relation to names differing from one another only through the presence or absence of diacritic marks 425

Printed in England by Metcalfe & Cooper Limited, 10-24 Scrutton St., London E C 2

VOLUME 10. Part 14
Pp. 427—458

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

24th July, 1953

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Copenhagen Discussions : Cases 53–63

LONDON:
Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1953

Price Twelve shillings and Sixpence

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)
Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming
Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.
Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1
Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Part 14 (pp. 427–458) 24th July, 1953

CASE No. 53

ARTICLES 34 AND 35 : PROPOSAL THAT DIFFERENCES IN SPELLING ARISING SOLELY FROM DIFFERENCES IN THE MANNER IN WHICH THE WORD FORMING THE NAME HAS BEEN TRANSLITERATED INTO THE LATIN ALPHABET FROM SOME OTHER ALPHABET SHOULD BE IGNORED FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE LAW OF HOMONYMY

DOOUMENT 53/1

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)530)

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

Dr. HELEN MUIR-WOOD'S PROPOSAL IN REGARD TO THE TREATMENT TO BE ACCORDED UNDER THE LAW OF HOMONYMY TO NAMES DIFFERING FROM ONE ANOTHER IN SPELLING ONLY BY REASON OF THE ADOPTION OF DIFFERENT METHODS FOR TRANSLITERATING A WORD FROM THE CYRILLIC, OR SOME OTHER, ALPHABET INTO THE LATIN ALPHABET

In 1951 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 90–92) Dr. Helen Muir-Wood (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*) submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature a request for a ruling on the question whether two names, each based upon the same modern patronymic but differing from one another in spelling by reason of the adoption of different methods for transliterating into the Latin alphabet from the Cyrillic or some other alphabet the word of which the names were based should, under Articles 34 (generic names and 35 (trivial names) be regarded as homonyms of one another. The example cited by Dr. Muir-Wood in her application was the case of the names *Jakowleffia* and *Yakowlevia*.

2. Dr. Muir-Wood was of the opinion that names of the foregoing class ought to be regarded as homonyms of one another and recommended the adoption of the following rule in respect both of Article 34 and of Article 35 :—

> Where each member of any given pair of generic names or, if in any given genus, of any pair of trivial names, whether specific or subspecific trivial names, or, on the other hand, infra-subspecific trivial names (1) is based upon the same surname and that surname is normally written in some alphabet other than the Latin alphabet, and (2) has the same termination and/or suffix, but the two names differ from one another in spelling only by reason of differences adopted in the transliteration of the surname comprised in the generic names (or trivial names) in question, the two generic names concerned (or, as the case may be, the two trivial names) are to be treated as homonyms of one another.

3. The only comments received in regard to this application came from Dr. K. H. L. Key (*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, Australia*) (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 250–251) and Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) (1952, *ibid.*, 6 : 251), and Dr. Henning Lemche (*Copenhagen*) (Document 53/2 annexed hereto). Of these, Mr. Baily supported Dr. Muir-Wood's proposal, while Dr. Key and Dr. Lemche are opposed to the recognition of diacritic marks at all.

4. I am myself in full agreement with Dr. Muir-Wood's proposal, but consider that it should be widened in scope, for the underlying problem is a general one which is liable to arise not only in relation to names based upon patronymics but also in relation to names based upon geographical terms and indeed in relation to any name based upon a word normally written in some alphabet other than the Latin alphabet. I accordingly suggest that the proposal submitted by Dr. Muir-Wood should be broadened on the following lines :—

(1) Where each generic name of a pair of such names is based upon a word normally written in some alphabet other than the Latin alphabet and the names bear the same termination and/or suffix and are thus identical except for differences arising from the adoption of different methods for transliterating into the Latin alphabet the word upon which the generic names are based, those generic names are to be treated as being homonyms of one another.

(2) The foregoing rule applies also within any given genus to any pair of names consisting of the trivial names of species or of genus subspecies of species referred to that genus.

5. The immediately following case (Case No. 54) is concerned with the parallel case presented by names based upon barbarous words (*i.e.*, upon words belonging to languages which do not possess an alphabet) and a suggestion is there made (in Document 54/1, paragraph 4) that a combined rule should be adopted for dealing both with that case and with that considered in the present note.

DOCUMENT 53/2

By **HENNING LEMCHE** (*Universitetets Zoologik Museum, Copenhagen*)

Letter dated 6th September, 1953

To the exposition presented by Dr. Helen Muir-Wood on the problems concerning transcription of names, I should like to make some remarks.

Names of genera may be constructed in several ways, one of which is the purely artificial one of putting together some letters to form an artificial word (Article 8, Recommandation (k)). This procedure, I think, makes it possible to get around any difficulty arising out of differing transcriptions of words or names from other alphabets. The essential thing is that the names shall not be so close to each other in appearance as to cause confusion. Therefore, *Mulleria* and *Muelleria* may perhaps be too close to each other—especially if they are given to animals in the same systematic group, but *Jaklowleffia* and *Yakovlevia* are so extremely different that I do not think that any real confusion can arise. We only have to state once and for ever that it is the *spelling*, not the meaning that decides. We cannot make too many philological speculations—earlier experience shows that these will mostly lead us astray.

I do not mean that we are to cancel any schedule as to how to transcribe correctly, but I think that we should not for philological reasons introduce new sources for emendations in cases where such recommandations have not been obeyed.

CASE No. 54

ARTICLES 34 AND 35 : PROPOSAL THAT DIFFERENCES IN THE SPELLING OF NAMES BASED UPON BARBAROUS WORDS ARISING SOLELY FROM THE ADOPTION OF DIFFERENT METHODS FOR TRANSCRIBING INTO THE LATIN ALPHABET THE BARBAROUS WORD CONCERNED SHOULD BE DISREGARDED FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE LAW OF HOMONYMY

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)739)

DOCUMENT 54/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

In the immediately preceding case (Case No. 53) we were concerned with the question whether any two otherwise identical names based upon a word normally written in some alphabet other than the Latin alphabet but differing from one another in spelling by reason of the adoption of different methods for transliterating the word concerned should be treated as homonyms of one another. A similar problem arises in connection with names based upon barbarous words (*i.e.*, upon words used in languages not possessing an alphabet).

2. Names of the class under consideration are for the most part based upon the names of places or other geographical terms, but there are, no doubt, also similar cases of names based upon patronymics (*e.g.*, names of chieftains, hunters, collectors and the like belonging to peoples who have no alphabet. Two examples of names which presumably belong, at least by origin, to the first of these groups are provided in the application relating to the trivial names of certain woodpeckers submitted by the Marquess Hachisuka (*Atami, Shizuoka Ken, Japan*) (see 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9** : 102–103). The names in question are *saghalinensis* and *sakhalinensis* and *tianschanicus* and *tianshanicus*. Cases of trivial names of this sort could be multiplied almost indefinitely ; I cannot at the moment recall an instance where this problem has arisen in connection with generic names but I do not doubt that cases of this kind have occurred in this field.

3. It would clearly be most confusing—as well as entirely illogical—to accept as available names in the same genus, pairs of names of the kind cited by the Marquess Hachisuka. It is accordingly suggested that the following rules should be adopted :—

(1) Where each generic name of any pair of such names is based upon a barbarous word (*i.e.*, upon a word belonging to a language not possessing an alphabet) and the names are identical except for differences in spelling arising from the adoption of different methods for transcribing the barbarous word concerned into the Latin alphabet, the generic names in question are to be treated as being homonyms of one another.

(2) The foregoing rule applies also within any given genus to any given pair of names consisting of the trivial names of species or of subspecies of species referred to that genus.

4. It might be considered convenient to group into a single rule to be added to Articles 34 and 35 both the rule suggested above and the rule suggested in Document 53/1 in Case No. 53 in relation to names based upon words normally written in some alphabet other than the Latin alphabet. In anticipation of such a view being adopted, the following draft of a combined rule is submitted for consideration :—

(1) Each generic name comprised in any pair of such names is to be treated as a homonym of the other :—

  (a) where the generic names in question (i) are based upon a word normally written in an alphabet other than the Latin alphabet and (ii) bear the same termination and/or suffix, and (iii) are thus identical except for differences in spelling arising from the adoption of different methods for transliterating into the Latin alphabet the word upon which the name is based ;

  (b) where the generic names in question (i) are based upon a barbarous word (*i.e.*, upon a word belonging to a language not possessing an alphabet) and (ii) are identical except for differences in spelling arising from the adoption of different methods for transcribing the barbarous word concerned into the Latin alphabet.

(2) The rules specified in (1) above apply also within any given genus to any pair of names consisting of the trivial names of species or of subspecies of species referred to that genus.

CASE No. 55

ARTICLE 35 : PROPOSED INSERTION OF A PROVISION THAT FOR THE PURPOSES OF ESTABLISHING A CONDITION OF SECONDARY HOMONYMY BETWEEN TWO SPECIFIC NAMES IT IS NOT NECESSARY THAT AN AUTHOR SHOULD EXPRESSLY CITE THE NAMES IN HOMONYMOUS COMBINATIONS BEFORE REJECTING AND REPLACING THE LATER PUBLISHED OF THE TWO TRIVIAL NAMES INVOLVED

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)586)

DOCUMENT 55/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

REPORT ON THE ADOPTION OF A " DECLARATION " CLARIFYING THE CONDITIONS NECESSARY TO ESTABLISH A CONDITION OF SECONDARY HOMONYMY BETWEEN ANY TWO SPECIFIC NAMES

The question whether for the purposes of establishing a condition of secondary homonymy between any two specific names it is necessary that an author should expressly cite the names in homonymous combinations before rejecting and replacing the later published of the two trivial names involved was first raised by Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty in the course of his application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the question of the correct trivial name for the Kidney Worm of Swine (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 286, 288–289). Dr. Dougherty took the view that express action of the foregoing kind was not a necessary condition for establishing a condition of secondary homonymy and added that, in order finally to dispose of this question, it was, in his view, desirable that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should make a pronouncement upon it. Accordingly, in agreement with Dr. Dougherty, a request for a *Declaration* on this subject was made by the Secretary to the International Commission (Hemming, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 120–122).

2. **Terms of the " Declaration " voted upon by the International Commission :** The following is the text of the proposed *Declaration* on which

the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature voted by post in 1952:

> For the purposes of the provision relating to the rejection of secondary homonyms, an author rejecting one name as a secondary homonym of another name is required to make it clear that he considers that the species bearing the trivial name so rejected is congeneric with another species bearing a previously published identical trivial name but is free to indicate his view on this subject in whatever way he may consider appropriate, provided that the method so adopted leaves no reasonable doubt that he considers the two species concerned to be congeneric with one another.

3. **Adoption on 22nd August, 1952, of a "Declaration" clarifying the procedure to be adopted in establishing the existence of a condition of secondary homonymy between two specific names:** The International Commission adopted on 22nd August, 1952, a *Declaration* on the foregoing subject in the terms of the draft set out in paragraph 2 above. Of the 18 members of the International Commission there voted in favour of the proposed *Declaration* the following 16 Commissioners (arranged in the order in which votes were received): W. T. Calman; E. M. Hering; J. R. Dymond; B. Hankó; P. Bonnet; H. E. Vokes; J. C. Bradley; A. do Amaral; F. Hemming; T. Esaki; N. D. Riley; H. Lemche; J. Pearson; N. R. Stoll; H. Boschma; A. Cabrera. No Commissioner voted against the proposed *Declaration*. No votes were received from two Commissioners (T. Jaczewski; R. Mertens).

4. **Submission of "Declaration" by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology:** Under the procedure governing the rendering by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of *Declarations* interpreting the *Règles*, an interpretation so given becomes operative immediately, but it is the duty of the International Commission to submit a *Declaration* so adopted to the next International Congress of Zoology for final approval. In accordance with the foregoing procedure, the *Declaration* set out in paragraph 2 of the present note adopted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by 16 votes (two Commissioners not voting) is hereby submitted to the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology for final approval.

CASE No. 56

TRANSCRIPTION OF THE LATIN " V " (VOWEL) AND " V " (CONSONANTAL) AND OF THE LATIN " I " (VOWEL) AND " I " (CONSONANTAL)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)393)

DOCUMENT 56/1

By **PIERRE BONNET** (*Université de Toulouse, France*)

Editorial Note : The following application was submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in 1948, but at the Paris Session was deferred for later consideration (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 209–212). The present application was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 199), but, as it is quite short, it is here reprinted for convenience of reference. (Intl'd.) F.H. 20th May, 1953.

Proposition 17

Ajouter a l'Appendice, un paragraphe " F " intitulé :

Transcription du " *v* " et du " *i* " latins

Les lettres " *v* " et " *i* " *deviennent* " *u* " et " *i* " *devant une consonne, et v* ou *j devant une voyelle.* Exemples :

1er cas : *urbs, ventus, illustris, imperialis.*

2^{e} cas : *dives, ventus, jugum, jacundis.*

En appliquant cette *règle* au préfixe " *Eu,*" elle donne en effet *Eusparassus*, *Eugnatha*, *Euphoresia*, etc, et doit donner *Evagrus*, *Evetria*, *Evathlus*, *Evangelium*, etc. (et non *Euagrus*, *Euetria*, *Euathlus*, *Euangelium*).

Explication : Les Romains n'avaient qu'une lettre pour l " *v* " voyelle et pour le " *v* " consonne ; une seule lettre aussi pour le " *i* " voyelle et le " *i* " consonne ; mais la pratique a voulu par la suite que le " *v* " voyelle devienne un "*u*" et le "*i*" consonne un "*j*"; il y a lieu de se conformer à cette practique et de l'appliquer intégralement en interdisant les écritures *iuguam, iucundis, Iupiter* et en obligeant les auteurs à écrire le préfixe "*eu*" sous cette forme devant une consonne: *Eusparassus, Eugnata* et l'écrire "*ev*" devant une voyelle: *Evagrus, Evetria*, termes qui sont plus euphoniques que *Euagrus* ou *Euetria*, bien que cette dernière écriture soit étymologiquement plus correcte.

DOCUMENT 56/2

By the late **LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO** (*University of Parma, Italy*)

Statement received on 19th January, 1948

PROPOSAL 17 BY PROFESSOR BONNET CONCERNING THE LATIN LETTERS "V" AND "I"

I fully agree with this proposal. The Latin letters "v" and "i" should always be written as "u" or "i" before a consonant; the Latin letter "i" should always be written as "j" before a vowel.

DOCUMENT 56/3

By **Dr. JIRI PACLT** (*Bratislava, Czechoslovakia*)

COMMENT ON PROFESSOR PIERRE BONNET'S PROPOSITION 17 CONCERNING THE ORTHOGRAPHY OF SCIENTIFIC NAMES

Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) proposed quite recently[1] that the following paragraph should be added to the Appendice to the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature.

Paragraph " F " entitled " Transcription of the Roman ' v ' and ' i ' ".—" The letters ' *v* ' and ' *i* ' before a consonant, and ' *v* ' and/or ' *j* ' before a vowel. Examples : *u*rbs, vent*us*, *i*llustr*is*, *i*mper*i*alis (in the former event) ; di*ves*, *v*entus, *j*ugum, *j*ucundis (in the latter case)."[2]

First, there must be referred to some inexactness in the above proposal. Should the letters " *v* " and " *i* " become respectively " *v* " and " *j* " before a vowel [sic], then the words imper*i*alis (quoted as an example, ut supra), Eq*u*us, conspic*u*us, ten*u*is, etc. are to be written imper*j*alis, E*qu*us, conspic*v*us, ten*v*is, etc. This is surely not intended by the author of that proposal. Accordingly, the dicta " before a consonant (i) and " before a vowel " (ii) are to be completed as follows : " before a consonant and, in addition, before a vowel at the ending of a syllable " (i) ; " before a vowel at the beginning of a syllable " (ii).

Unfortunately, these amendments of the original dicta of Professor Bonnet cause serious trouble if we consider the transcription of Greek diphthongs like *αι*, *ει*, *οι*, *υι*, *αν*, *εν*, followed by a vowel. How names such as Agl*ai*a, *Αγλαια*, M*ei*oneurites, *Μειονεοριτης*, O*i*orhinus, *Οιορριγος*, *Eu*onymus, *Εὐωνυμος*, Evetria, *Ευετρια*, are to be spelt in that case ? The philologically correct spellings of these names would be : Agl*ae*a, M*eo*neurites (better than M*io*neurites), *Oe*rhinus, *Eu*onymus and *Eu*eteria.

According to Article 70 of the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature and Article 19 of the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature, the original spelling of a name must be ratained, except in the case of a typographic error, or of a clearly unintentional orthographic error (error of transcription, a *lapsus calami*). When this rule is applied to the above mentioned examples, we find it necessary to use the original forms Agl*ai*a, M*ei*oneurites, *Oi*orhinus, *Eu*onymus, *Ev*etria. It may be proposed, however, to authors of new names that, owing to the requirement of euphony, the following suggestions should be regarded in the future :

---

[1] *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 3 : 199, 1950 and Document 56/1.

[2] The original text in French put here into English.

(i) the diphthong ει be transliterated before a vowel as *e*, and before a consonant as *i* ;

(ii) the diphthongs αι and οι be still transliterated as *ao* and *oe* respectively ;

(iii) the diphthongs αυ and ου be still transliterated as *au* and *u* respectively ;

(iv) the diphthong ευ be transliterated before a vowel as *ev*, and before a consonant as *eu*, *e.g.*, *εὐευρετος*, ev*eure*tus.

The question of writing the simple letters *v* (*u*) and *i* (*j*) being rather of typographic than orthographic nature, we may use the rules of transcription prospectively and retrospectively, provided that a proposal for the amended version of the respective paragraphs will be accepted. Such minor additions to the Code would bring the official biological nomenclature in greater compliance with the practice.

On the other hand, some rules of the transliteration of Greek diphthongs cannot have any power to change the original orthography of names, and may only be considered as being a prospective and non-retroactive recommendation.

Jiri Paclt, ScD.,
Forest Products Research Laboratory,
Bratislava, Czechoslovakia.

CASE No. 57

NEW ARTICLE RELATING TO THE STATUS OF NAMES PUBLISHED AS THE NAMES OF INFRA-SUBSPECIFIC FORMS : PROPOSAL TO EXTEND THE PERIOD OF GRACE BEFORE THE NEW RULES APPLY IN THEIR ENTIRETY TO NAMES PUBLISHED FOR TAXONOMIC UNITS BELOW THE SPECIES LEVEL BUT NOT CLEARLY INTENDED TO APPLY TO POPULATIONS AS CONTRASTED WITH INDIVIDUAL FORMS AND OTHER MINORITY ELEMENTS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)718)

DOCUMENT 57/1

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

ON THE RELATION TO THE EXISTING PROVISIONS REGARDING THE STATUS OF NAMES GIVEN TO INFRA-SUBSPECIFIC FORMS OF THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY UNDER COVER OF A LETTER DATED 19th JUNE, 1952, FROM PROFESSOR CHARLES D. MICHENER, THEN CHAIRMAN OF THE NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE ABOVE SOCIETY

Annexed hereto as Document 57/2 is a paper prepared on behalf of the Society of Systematic Zoology on the subject of the status of names published for infra-subspecific forms and the relationship of such names to names published as the names of species and subspecies. This document was forwarded to the International Commission under cover of a letter dated 19th June, 1952, signed by Professor Charles D. Michener, Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee of the above Society; both these documents were actually communicated to the International Commission by Mr. W. I. Follett who had succeeded Professor Michener as Chairman of the above Committee before the despatch of the letter prepared by Professor Michener.

2. The document referred to above states clearly the object which it is desired to attain but it does not make it clear to what extent and in what respects the proposal submitted would call for the amendment of the existing

rules on this subject. Accordingly, in order to facilitate the further consideration of this proposal, the present note has been prepared to show the nature of the changes sought.

3. The proposal submitted in Document 57/2 is twofold in character or rather one main proposal is submitted, and a second more limited proposal is put forward for consideration if the main proposal fails to secure support. The proposals are :—

(1) " A name of less than specific rank published before 1st January, 1954, shall be considered for nomenclatorial purposes a subspecies if at the time of the original publication the author did not definitely indicate that he considered it an infra-subspecific form by calling it an aberration, transition, form, phase or seasonal form. Perhaps more such names could be safely added to this list."

(2) " In any event, varietal names published before 1st January, 1954, should be available for specific or subspecific names. An important point is that " variety " was widely used by many taxonomists as a synonym of " subspecies ".

4. It will be seen that the proposals submitted relate (a) to the definition to be adopted for the group of names which, by reason of being names published as names for infra-subspecific forms should be regarded as ineligible for consideration, as from the date of such publication, as names for species and subspecies, and (b) to the date to be adopted as that as from which the definition under (a) above should become operative. It will be convenient at this point to take note of what are the existing rules in regard to the above matters.

5. Existing definition of a " name of an infra-subspecific form " : The existing rules start by prescribing the terms to be applied to denote the two groups of names to be recognised below the species level, namely " subspecific name " and " infra-subspecific name " (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 89, Conclusion 1(2)). Each of these expressions is then defined for nomenclatorial purposes as follows (1950, *ibid.* **4** : 89–90, Conclusion 1(3)) :—

> As used in connection with the foregoing categories of name, the expression " subspecies " and " infra-subspecific form " shall have the meanings specified below :—

Expression	*Definition of expression.*
" subspecies "	A population (*e.g.*, geographical, ecological) within a species which differs from any other such population within the same species.
" infra-subspecific form "	Any form of a species other than a subspecies as defined above (*e.g.*, seasonal forms and minority elements of all kinds within a species such as sexual forms, transition forms, aberrations, etc.

6. Difficulties which the form adopted for the definition of " subspecies " and "Infra-subspecific form" was designed to overcome: It will be seen at once that the definitions adopted were designed to denote the concepts represented by the expressions " subspecies " and " infra-subspecific form " and not to provide a catalogue of the expressions which, when used by authors in publishing a new name, should be held to indicate in the one case whether the name in question was being published as a " subspecific name " or, on the other hand, as an " infra-subspecific name ". This method of providing definitions was adopted deliberately for two reasons : (a) It would be quite impossible either in the case of " subspecies " or in that of " infra-subspecific form " to provide a complete catalogue of the terms which, when used by an author on publishing a new name, were to be held to denote the foregoing concepts, owing partly to the great variety of such terms in any given language and partly to the fact that in countries using different languages different words were used to denote these concepts. Moreover, to use Dr. J. Brookes Knight's now celebrated phrase, it would in the case of a subspecies be highly " ritualistic " and therefore undesirable to make it an essential requirement that some specified word (*e.g.*, " subspecies," " race," etc.) to be used in order to clothe with availability the name given to what from the description was quite clearly intended to be a name for a population. (b) Some words had become so time-worn that it was impossible to ascertain from the word itself, without reference to the accompanying description (and not always then), whether the word used was intended to denote a population (" subspecies ") or only some minority element (" infra-subspecific form "). The outstanding example of a word which no longer possessed a definite content was the word " variety " and its Latin version " varietas." Difficulties of this sort would not arise, however, if the definition adopted in the *Règles* was directed to the meaning of the author of a new name and not to the word or expression which he used to denote that name. It was for these reasons that the definitions quoted in paragraph 5 above were adopted in preference to definitions attempting to catalogue, and to assign meanings to, expressions used by authors when publishing names for taxonomic units belonging to categories below the species level.

7. Interlocked character of the definitions adopted for nomenclatorial purposes for the expressions " subspecies " and " infra-subspecific form " : It will be noted from the quotation given in paragraph 5 above that the definitions adopted for the expressions " subspecies " and " infra-subspecific form " are directly linked to one another, the simplest kind of definition being given to the expression " subspecies," the expression " infra-subspecific form " being defined as containing any form within a species other than a " subspecies, " as defined. The whole basis of the scheme for providing a status for names of " infra-subspecific forms " independent of that accorded to the names of " subspecies "(and species) hinges, therefore, upon the adoption of a definition of the expression " subspecies " for nomenclatorial purposes. It is because the whole object of the scheme was to provide a basis for names given to infra-subspecific forms which would not inconvenience in any way the large number of zoologists who feel no need for recognising the category " infra-subspecific form," as contrasted with the category " subspecies " (" population ") that it is necessary to provide in the *Règles* definitions for these two categories for nomenclatorial purposes, since, unlike other categories dealt with in the *Règles*, names belonging to these two categories are subject to independent rules and are not co-ordinate with one another as are the names of genera and subgenera and the names of species and subspecies. The solution actually adopted made it necessary to provide in the *Règles* a substantive definition, as we have already seen, for one only of the two categories to be defined. Thus the necessity for inserting definitions—which is deplored by Dr. K. H. L. Key in Document 57/3—was reduced to the minimum compatible with the introduction of the desired scheme. In order to minimise the risk of misunderstandings, particular care was taken both (i) to underline the fact that the definition was given solely for nomenclatorial purposes (in order to distinguish " subspecific names " and " infra-subspecific names " from one another) and (ii) to ensure that the definition so adopted for the expression " subspecies " should be as simple as possible. It was for this reason that the definition adopted was confined to the single concept of a " population."

8. **Means provided for determining whether a given name was published as a " subspecific name " or as an " infra-subspecific name " :** The second part of the scheme for according—subject to certain conditions—a status under the *Règles* to names for infra-subspecific forms was to provide means for identifying such names and thus for separating them from names given to subspecies. The solution here adopted was to prescribe a more rigorous standard for names published after a certain date subsequent to the adoption of the scheme and a more lenient one for names published before that date. For names published after the prescribed date it was required that the author should make it clear, if the name was to rank as having been published for a subspecies, that he intended it to apply to a population, while, in the case of names published before that date, all names were to rank as having been published for populations (*i.e.*, for subspecies), except where the author made it clear that this was not so.

9. **The prescribed date for the coming into force of the scheme for giving a limited status to infra-subspecific names :** The provisions relating to the names of infra-subspecific names came into operation as from midnight 31st December, 1950/1st January, 1951.

10. **The proposals submitted on behalf of the Society of Systematic Zoology :** Having now taken note of the relevant portions of the present rules relating to the naming of infra-subspecific forms, we may turn back to examine the extent to which the proposals submitted on behalf of the Society of Systematic Zoology (paragraph 3 above) involve proposed changes in the existing rules. These changes are now seen to be the following :—

(1) **Date of commencement of the scheme :** It is proposed by the Society that the date fixed for the coming into operation of the scheme

should be postponed by three years, *i.e.*, from 1st January, 1951 to 1st January, 1954.

(2) **Means to be adopted for identifying a name as a name given to an infra-subspecific form :** It is proposed that in respect of names published after the date recommended in (1) above, a name should rank as having been given to a subspecies—or at least that it should be available for use as such as from its original date of publication—in all cases except where the author expressly indicated that he was applying the name to some minority element as defined in (3) below and not to a whole population. In other words, the proposal is to apply to all names, irrespective of date of publication, the more lenient of the two existing tests, *i.e.*, the test at present applicable only to names published before the prescribed date (1st January, 1951).

(3) **Definition of " infra-subspecific form " :** It is suggested that a name should be held to have been published as a name for an infra-subspecific name by reference to the words used by the author to denote the taxonomic unit concerned at the time when he named it and that an attempt should be made to list the words to be accepted as indicating that a name was published as an " infra-subspecific name."

(4) **A proposal alternative to proposals (2) and (3) above :** It is suggested, as a possible alternative to proposals (2) and (3) above, that there should be inserted a provision prescribing that, wherever the expression " var." (*varietas*) is applied to a taxonomic unit, on a name being given to that unit, the name so given should rank as having been given to a subspecies and not to an infra-subspecific form. The application does not make it clear whether it is suggested that this provision should apply to names published on or after 1st January, 1954, or only to names published before that date.

DOCUMENT 57/2

Report furnished by Professor CHARLES D. MICHENER, when Chairman of the **COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY**

Letter, dated 19th June, 1952, from Professor **CHARLES D. MICHENER,** communicated under cover of a letter dated 27th July, 1952, by Mr. **W. I. FOLLETT,** Professor Michener's successor as chairman of the above Committee.

The Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology has recently made a study of a number of nomenclatorial problems. In some instances it has sent a ballot to members of the Society in order that its opinion and recommendations to you would correctly reflect the viewpoint of American taxonomists.

The material on the enclosed sheets* deals with the results of such ballots. It is transmitted to you with the request that the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be notified of the stand of the Society on the problems concerned, and that, where Rules or *Opinions* are involved, this stand be considered in connection with the proposed revisions of the *Règles*.

Enclosure to Professor Michener's letter of 19th June, 1952

Infra-specific Names

The rules concerning infra-specific names adopted at the Paris (1948) meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 4, pp. 81–96, contain a proposal which has been adversely criticised by many members of the Society of Systematic Zoology, and is particularly important for entomologists and other invertebrate zoologists.

It is provided that a name of less than specific rank published before 1st January, 1951, shall be considered for nomenclatorial purposes a subspecies if at the time of original publication the author indicated he considered it as such or if he failed to indicate its status. It shall be considered as infra-subspecific name only if the author so indicated.

Very many forms have been described through the years as varieties and the like and later raised to subspecific or specific status. They do not qualify as subspecific or specific names, since the authors neither stated that they considered them subspecies nor failed to indicate their status. The task of searching the literature to find when each such name was first stated to be a subspecies or a species, crediting it to a new author and a new date, and then determining whether it is, with its new date, a synonym or homonym, would be immense, and the result would be many thousands of name changes.

To get a clear idea of the view of members of the Society of Systematic Zoology, the following brief synonymies (A and B), with the ballot questions indicated, were sent to the membership of the Society of Systematic Zoology.

**Ed. Note:* The other sheets enclosed by Professor Michener are published elsewhere in the present volume, (initialled) F.H. 20th May, 1953.

(A) *Alpha beta* var. *gamma* Smith, 1890.
Alpha gamma Jones, 1920 (based on Smith's var. *gamma*).

As of 1945 *After Paris decisions*

(1) I would use *gamma* Smith, 1890, for this species.

(2) I would use *gamma* Smith, 1920, for this species.

(B) *Alpha nigra* aberration *alba* Smith, 1920.
Alpha alba Jones, 1930 (based on Smith's aberr. *alba*).

(1) I would use *alba* Smith, 1920, for this species.

(2) I would use *alba* Jones, 1930, for this species.

The results show that a large majority of taxonomists, not only before 1948 but also after, would regard names proposed as varieties and even aberrations (before some date such as 1st January, 1951) as co-ordinate with specific names, not with infra-subspecific names.

I therefore recommend that the following provision be incorporated into the *Règles* : A name of less than specific rank published before 1st January, 1954 shall be considered for nomenclatorial purposes a subspecies if at the time of original publication the author did not definitely indicate that he considered it an infra-subspecific form by calling it an aberration, transition, form, phase, or seasonal form. Perhaps more such names could be safely added to this list. In any event varietal names published before 1st January, 1954, should be available for specific or subspecific names. An important point is that "variety" was widely used by many taxonomists as a synonym of " subspecies ".

Charles D. Michener,
Chairman, Nomenclature Committee,
Society of Systematic Zoology.

DOCUMENT 57/3

By **K. H. L. KEY** (*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, Australia*)

Extract from a letter dated 17th October, 1952

While I appreciate the reasons that prompted the Commission and the Paris Congress to decide to incorporate in the Code a definition of the concept " subspecies," I feel that serious dangers are associated with such a course of action. The Code contains no definition of the far more important concepts " species " and " genus," and I imagine that it would be impossible to reach any agreement on definitions of the kind that would enable a zoologist to determine what he should regard as a species and what as a genus. In effect, the Code regards as a species any entity held to be a species by any author—and so with " genus ". It says, " *If* you have a species, then such and such rules apply " ; but it offers you no guidance as to whether you have a species or not. In other words, the Code confines itself to nomenclatorial issues and avoids taxonomic issues. I am afraid that whatever definition of subspecies may be used in the Code, there will be a storm of protest, probably with outright refusals to accept the definition. I therefore consider that if it is humanly possible to frame rules governing subspecific nomenclature without attempting to set up an " official " definition, then that should be done. If it is not possible, then I am uncertain as to the wisdom of setting up such rules at all. I am sorry that this comment is almost wholly destructive, but it is the only comment I can make in the time at my disposal.

CASE No. 58

INFRA-SUBSPECIFIC NAMES : PROPOSAL TO WITHDRAW RECOGNITION

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)742)

DOCUMENT 58/1

NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY

Statement received under cover of a letter dated 27th July, 1952, from
Mr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman of the above Committee

I enclose reports (in duplicate) on the remaining five nomenclatorial problems that were submitted to ballot of the entire membership of the Society of Systematic Zoology during Dr. Charles D. Michener's chairmanship of the nomenclature committee of that Society.

These reports* are entitled as follows :

. . . .

(2) " Infra-subspecific Nomenclatural Categories."

. . . .

This material is transmitted to you for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, with the request that the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be notified of the stand of the Society on the problems concerned, and that, where Rules or *Opinions* are involved, this stand be considered in connection with the proposed revisions of the *Règles*.

Annexe to Document 58/1

INFRA-SUBSPECIFIC NOMENCLATURAL CATEGORIES

During Dr. Charles D. Michener's chairmanship of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology, the following ballot was distributed to the members of that society :

(1) I recommend that no category of less than subspecific rank be accorded nomenclatural recognition.

---

*The other documents here referred to are being published at the appropriate parts in the present volume.

(2) I recommend that infra-subspecific categories be accorded nomenclatural recognition in one way or another.

According to Dr. Michener's tabulation of the votes cast, the result was as follows :

(1) 211 (infra-subspecific nomenclatural categories not to be recognised).

(2) 86 (infra-subspecific nomenclatural categories to be recognised).

In view of these returns, it is strongly recommended that the action of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the Paris (1948) meeting, in recognising quadrinominals, be reversed, and that no nomenclatural category of less than subspecific rank be recognised by the *Règles*.

Dated 27th July, 1952.

W. I. Follett,
Chairman, Nomenclature Committee,
Society of Systematic Zoology.

DOCUMENT 58/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

Attention is invited to two considerations which arise on the preceding request (Document 58/1) for the revocation of the decision taken in 1948 to provide a nomenclatorial basis for the names of infra-subspecific forms for use by those zoologists who find it necessary or desirable for their work that infra-subspecific forms should be recognised and desire that means should be provided for regulating names given to such forms :—

(1) Many zoologists—of whom I am one—see no need for the purposes of their own work to give names to infra-subspecific forms. The lack of a definition in the *Règles* of what constitutes a subspecies for nomenclatorial purposes and the fact that many workers treated the undefined use of the word " subspecies " in Articles 11 and 12 as rendering available for promotion to the rank of subspecific (and, therefore, of specific) rank names expressly published for minority elements (seasonal forms, sexual forms, etc.) had led by 1948 to a state of confusion which called urgently for attention. Moreover, as long as there was any doubt as to the availability of such names for promotion to be the names of subspecies and species, an immense and quite unnecessary labour was imposed upon all zoologists who found no need to recognise infra-subspecific forms, for it was necessary for them carefully to list all such names and to take account of them for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy. Many zoologists felt that the best course would be to refuse all recognition in the *Règles* to such names, but—as is illustrated by Document 57/2 also submitted by the Society of Systematic Zoology—such a course would have involved serious problems, in view of the difficulty—in many cases—of determining whether a given name was published as a subspecific name or as an infra-subspecific name, and the considerable number of such names currently applied to subspecies in various groups. Quite apart from these considerations, there was also the fact that a substantial body of workers—particularly in certain groups—attached great importance to the naming of infra-subspecific forms, and demanded the grant of recognition to such names.

The solution adopted in 1948 was designed to overcome the difficulties hitherto caused to zoologists who did not desire the recognition of infra-subspecific forms or of the names given to them, while at the same time meeting the demands of those workers who attached importance to infra-subspecific forms and to giving them names. This object was achieved by giving to infra-subspecific names a status under the *Règles* but one independent of that given to subspecific names, means being provided, however, for the transfer, where necessary, of a name from one of these categories to the other. The advantage of this arrangement was that it relieved zoologists who objected to such names of any need for taking them into account, while at the same time it provided a basis for such names for those workers who used them and attached importance to them. This solution was, in effect, a " live-and-let-live " solution, each point of view being substantially met, neither side imposing upon the other a solution distasteful to it.

Now that this question has been raised again, it is to be hoped that it will be approached in the same spirit and that workers holding each of the opposing points of view will pay regard not only to the objectives to which they themselves attach importance but also to those to which importance is attached by those who hold the opposite point of view.

(2) It must be noted that the present is the second of two papers on the subject of infra-subspecific nomenclature which have been submitted by the Society of Systematic Zoology, the other being that to which Document 57/2 has been allotted. The two documents were submitted separately and no explanation was furnished as to their relationship to one another. My understanding of these documents is that Document 58/1 is intended to secure the discarding of infra-subspecific names as a separate category of name recognised in the *Règles*, while Document 57/2 is intended to confer a status in zoological nomenclature upon infra-subspecific names, if published in a manner so ambiguous that they might be regarded as being intended to apply to subspecies, so that names published in this way may be available for use as subspecific names. This is a matter which will need to be cleared up when these papers come to be discussed.

CASE No. 59

NOMENCLATURE OF THE SPECIFIC COMPLEX

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)685)

DOCUMENT 59/1

By **S. G. KIRIAKOFF**, L.SC.
(*Zoological Museum, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium*)

THE NOMENCLATURE OF THE SPECIFIC COMPLEX

So far as I am aware, there have not been up to now propositions submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature regarding the nomenclature of the specific complex. Although a great improvement has been achieved by the elimination of the so-called " infra-subspecific " names, there still remain so far only two taxonomic categories belonging to the specific complex and officially recognised by the *Règles*. These two categories are the species and the subspecies.

On the other hand, not only has the necessity of using a few additional taxonomic categories belonging to the complex just referred to, been long felt, but numerous workers have actually used and are using such categories in a number of recent publications. The categories so used are the following: the ultraspecies (superspecies of Mayr) and the semispecies (I have called these two " circumspecific " categories) ; further, the cline ; and finally, distinction has been made by some writers, on the suggestion of J. S. Huxley, between subspecific units of various origin, *i.e.*, between geographic, ecological and cytological subspecies or races.

I suggest therefore the above question to be submitted to the forthcoming Zoological Congress, or directly to the Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in order to provide with a legal status at least those of the taxonomic categories listed above which have already been used in recent works.

The arrangement I propose is the following :

(a) Intraspecific categories :

(1) Geographical race : the name of such a race follows the specific name and is preceded by a capital G ;

(2) Ecological race : as above, but preceded by a capital Œ ;

(3) Cytological race : as above, but preceded by a capital C ;

(4) Cline : composed of the names of the two peripheric (initial and terminal) races which the cline includes, this combination being preceded by the abbreviation Cl (as proposed by Huxley) ; each of the peripheric races is named as under (1) or (2) above.

(b) Circumspecific categories :

(1) Species proper : named binomially ;

(2) Semi-species : the name of the first described form included in a semi-specific complex precedes that of each of the remaining forms involved and is placed in parentheses. If the semi-specific name is that of the first described form involved, this last is of course repeated and parentheses used as above ;

(3) Ultra-species (not synonymous with superspecies of Mayr : *cf.* Kiriakoff, *Bull. Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg.* 84, 1948 : 64 ; —, *The Lepidopterists' News,* 2, 1948 : 1) : named binomially ; the name used is that of the first described form, preceded by a capital U. The name of each form included in an ultra-species is written following the name of the first described form in the complex. The prior form is placed in ordinary parentheses if the included form is a race or a semi-species, and in square parentheses if it is a good species.

CASE No. 60

PROPOSED SUBSTITUTION OF THE TERM " SPECIFIC NAME " IN PLACE OF THE TERM " TRIVIAL NAME " FOR THE SECOND PORTION OF A BINOMINAL COMBINATION

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)697)

DOCUMENT 60/1

Statement furnished by the **NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK**

Enclosure to a letter dated 18th July, 1952, from Dr. **ERNST MAYR**

The term " specific name " has been universally used, since about 1800, for the *specific epithet* of the scientific name (binomial). This usage was codified in the Strickland Code (1842) and has been included in every Code of Zoological Nomenclature since that period. It is the wording of the International Code of 1901. This wording is logical and unambiguous, because within the binomial scientific name it is the specific name which *specifies*. The word *specific* is the clear counterpart to the word *generic* for the generic component which designates the group name component within the scientific name.

The suggestion was made in Paris to shift the word *specific* from its time-honoured usage to a new role as the term for the whole scientific binomial. The Commission is herewith petitioned to annul this confusing transfer and to confirm the term " specific name " for the specific epithet of the binomial.

It is furthermore proposed to introduce the term " binomial " or " binominal " to designate the whole binomial scientific name.

The revival of the Linnaean term *trivial*, which was abandoned by early post-Linnaean authors, is to be deplored. Its application to subspecific and variety names causes considerable conceptual difficulties. Furthermore, the term trivial is confusing for linguistic reasons. To the average person in Anglo-Saxon countries the term " trivial name " means a " trifling, negligible name " while in most other European languages " trivial name " means " vernacular name ".

Signed :

The Nomenclature Committee at the American Museum of Natural History, New York.

ERNST MAYR
JOHN T. ZIMMER
G. H. H. TATE
C. H. CURRAN

CASE No. 61

PROPOSED ADOPTION OF THE ADJECTIVE " NOMINATE " IN PLACE OF THE ADJECTIVE " NOMINOTYPICAL " TO DENOTE THE SUBSPECIES OF A POLYTYPIC SPECIES UPON WHICH THE ORIGINAL DESCRIPTION OF THAT SPECIES WAS BASED

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)690)

DOCUMENT 61/1

By the **NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK**

Enclosure to a letter, dated 1st July, 1952, from Dr. **ERNST MAYR**

We propose that the word " nominotypical " throughout the text of the Rules be replaced by the more appropriate word " nominate ".

As explained by Simpson, Rensch, Mayr and other authorities on the principles of taxonomy, a nominate subspecies is no more " typical " than any other subspecies of a species, nor is a nominate subgenus more typical than any other subgenus, or a nominate subfamily than any other subfamily. The only attribute that distinguishes nominate sub-categories is that they include the " onomatophores," the name bearers of the category. The term " nominate " is not only in more universal usage than " nomin-typical," it is also shorter and it avoids the potential confusion of a typological interpretation of the respective categories.

Signed :

The Nomenclature Committee at the American
Museum of Natural History, New York.

ERNST MAYR
G. H. H. TATE
JOHN T. ZIMMER
C. H. CURRAN

CASE No. 62

NEED FOR UNIFORMITY OF RULES OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE FOR THE WHOLE OF THE ANIMAL KINGDOM

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)61)

DOCUMENT 62/1

By the **NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY**

Letter, dated 27th July, 1952, from Mr. W. I. FOLLETT,
Chairman of the above Committee

I enclose reports (in duplicate) on the remaining five nomenclatorial problems that were submitted to ballot of the entire membership of the Society of Systematic Zoology during Dr. Charles D. Michener's chairmanship of the nomenclature committee of that society.

These reports* are entitled as follows :

(1) " Extent of Uniformity of Rules."

. . . .

This material is transmitted to you for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, with the request that the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be notified of the stand of the Society on the problems concerned, and that, where Rules or *Opinions* are involved, this stand be considered in connection with the proposed revisions of the *Règles*.

---

*The other documents here referred to are being published at the appropriate parts in th present volume.

Annexe to Document 62/1

EXTENT OF UNIFORMITY OF RULES

During Dr. Charles D. Michener's chairmanship of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology, the following ballot was distributed to the members of that Society :

(1) I prefer uniform rules of nomenclature for the whole of zoology.

(2) I prefer separate (although presumably similar) rules for such major fields as entomology, ornithology, etc., except that a generic name in one field which is a junior homonym of a generic name in another field would be invalid.

(3) I prefer separate rules for each major field, without contact even on the point of generic homonymy.

According to Dr. Michener's tabulation of the votes cast, the result was as follows :

(1) 280 (uniform rules for whole of zoology).

(2) 26 (separate rules, except on homonymy, for major fields).

(3) 6 (entirely separate rules for each major field).

In view of these returns, it is urgently requested that uniform rules of nomenclature be maintained for the whole of zoology.

Dated 27th July, 1952.

W. I. Follett,
Chairman, Nomenclature Committee
Society of Systematic Zoology.

CASE No. 63

TREND AWAY FROM " AUTOMATIC NOMENCLATURE "

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)62)

DOCUMENT 63/1

By the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY

Letter, dated 27th July, 1952, from Mr. W. I. FOLLETT,
Chairman of the above Committee

I enclose reports (in duplicate) on the remaining five nomenclatorial problems that were submitted to ballot of the entire memhership of the Society of Systematic Zoology during Dr. Charles D. Michener's chairmanship of the Nomenclature Committee of that Society.

These reports* are entitled as follows :

. . . .

(5) " Trend away from " ' Automatic Nomenclature ' ".
This material is transmitted to you for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, with the request that the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be notified of the stand of the Society on the problems concerned, and that, where Rules or *Opinions* are involved, this stand be considered in connection with the proposed revisions of the *Règles*.

Annexe to Document 63/1

TREND AWAY FROM " AUTOMATIC NOMENCLATURE "

During Dr. Charles D. Michener's Chairmanship of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology, the following ballot was distributed to the members of that Society :

(1) I approve of the trend away from " automatic nomenclature," involving increased use of the plenary powers of the Commission, the

---

*The other documents here referred to are being published at the appropriate parts in the present volume.

establishment of long lists of nomina conservanda, and points in the rules where the worker is instructed to consult the Commission.

(2) I deplore the trend away from " automatic nomenclature."

According to Dr. Michener's tabulation of the votes cast, the result was as follows :

(1) 147 (approve trend away from "automatic nomenclature ").

(2) 151 (deplore trend away from " automatic nomenclature ").

As the plurality of four votes out of a total of 298 does not appear mathematically significant, this report is tendered for the purpose of recording the division of opinion within the Society.

Dated 27th July, 1952

W. I. Follett,
Chairman, Nomenclature Committee,
Society of Systematic Zoology

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

CONTENTS

Copenhagen Discussions : Cases 53–63

Page

Case No. 53 : Articles 34 and 35 : proposal that differences in spelling arising solely from differences in the manner in which the word forming the name has been transliterated into the Latin alphabet from some other alphabet should be ignored for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy 427

Case No. 54 : Articles 34 and 35 : proposal that differences in the spelling of names based upon barbarous words arising solely from the adoption of different methods for transcribing into the Latin alphabet the barbarous word concerned should be disregarded for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy 430

Case No. 55 : Article 35 : proposed insertion of a provision that for the purposes of establishing a condition of secondary homonymy between two specific names it is not necessary that an author should expressly cite the names in homonymous combinations before rejecting and replacing the later published of the two trivial names involved .. 432

Case No. 56 : Transcription of the Latin " v " (vowel) and " v " (consonantal) and of the Latin " i " (vowel) and " i " (consonantal) .. 434

Case No. 57 : New Article relating to the status of names published as the names of infra-subspecific forms : proposal to extend the period of grace before the new rules apply in their entirety to names published for taxonomic units below the species level but not clearly intended to apply to populations as contrasted with individual forms and other minority elements 438

Case No. 58 : Infra-subspecific names : proposal to withdraw recognition 446

Case No. 59 : Nomenclature of the specific complex 450

Case No. 60 : Proposed substitution of the term " specific name " in place of the term " trivial name " for the second portion of a binominal combination 452

Case No. 61 : Proposed adoption of the adjective " nominate " in place of the adjective " nominotypical " to denote the subspecies of a polytypic species upon which the original description of that species was based 454

Case No. 62 : Need for uniformity of rules of zoological nomenclature for the whole of the Animal Kingdom 455

Case No. 63 : Trend away from " automatic nomenclature " 457

Printed in England by Metcalfe & Cooper Limited, 10-24 Scrutton St., London E C 2

VOLUME 10. Part 15
Pp. 459—513

PURCHASED
29 AUG 1953

24th July, 1953

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Documents relating to Cases 64 to 70 prepared for consideration at Copenhagen, July-August 1953

LONDON:
Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1953

Price One Pound, Five Shillings

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)
Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming
Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.
Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1
Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Part 15 (pp. 459-513) 24th July 1953

PART 3

PROPOSALS FOR BROADENING THE BASIS OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE, FOR THE FURTHER REGULATION OF THE RULES RELATING TO ITS COMPOSITION, THE ELECTION OF ITS MEMBERS AND THEIR TERM OF SERVICE, AND FOR THE ELABORATION OF THE PROCEDURE OF THAT BODY

CASE NO. 64

PROPOSAL FOR BROADENING THE BASIS OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)57)

DOCUMENT 64/1

By the **AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PARASITOLOGISTS**

Letter dated 30th October, 1952, from Dr. A. C. WALTON,
Secretary to the above Society

As Secretary of the American Society of Parasitologists, I am forwarding a number of enclosures for your study. These are the result of a study carried out by a special committee of our organization and the results as stated in the accompanying letters were authorized by the Society at its annual meeting held this last September.

Accordingly the letters * have been drawn up and after receiving the final review by the Council of the Society are being forwarded to you as Secretary and also to the other members of the Committee as named at the beginning of the major enclosure ϕ.

Enclosure to Dr. Walton's letter of 30th October, 1952

September 6, 1952

Comité International Permanent des Congrès de Zoologie : M. CAULLERY, Paris, *President* ; L. FAGE, Paris, *Secretaire-Général* ; F. BALTZER, Berne ; H. BOSCHMA, Leiden ; A. GHIGI, Bologne ; E. HINDLE, Londres ; S. HÖRSTADIUS, Upsala ; A. R. JORGE, Lisbonne, A. KÜHN, Göttingen ; E. N. PAVLOVSKY, Moscou ; G. G. SIMPSON, New York ; R. SPÄRCK, Copenhague ; V. van STRAELEN, Bruxelles ; E. WITSCHI, Iowa City.

---

* The other letters here referred to have been published elsewhere in the present volume.

ϕ The document termed by Dr. Walton as the " major enclosure " is that reproduced above.

Gentlemen :

The American Society of Parasitologists and its individual members are interested in achieving uniformity and stability in zoological nomenclature through international co-operation of the type provided by the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature and the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. A committee was appointed at the annual meeting of the Society in November of 1951 to study the controversy that followed the announcement that " far-reaching decisions in regard to zoological nomenclature (had been) taken by the Thirteenth International Congress "[1]. The Committee was instructed to report its findings and recommendations to the American Society of Parasitologists at its annual meeting in September of 1952.

The committee found that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, as evidenced by the reports of its Secretary, was actively and energetically carrying out the responsibilities of its office. The Society wishes to express its gratitude for these efforts. However, as the Secretary of the Commission warned, "Any organisation must lose part of its moral authority if its membership cannot be effectively called in question by the general electorate to which it is nominally responsible ".[2] The Committee found that the critics of the Commission felt that the Commission had in fact lost some of its " moral authority " since they objected more strongly to its procedures than to many of its decisions. The American Society of Parasitologists is most anxious that the International Commission and the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature shall enjoy complete authority in nomenclatorial matters among all zoologists.

The International Commission and consequently the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature for many years maintained their authority because the Commission moved slowly and acted only after wide discussion of the problems involved. Furthermore, the Commission's voting procedure, including in some cases what amounted to a right of veto for any Commissioner, assured that good agreement was obtained before any action was taken. While this ponderous procedure assured careful (but not always infallible) actions, it was so inefficient that the work of the Commission was hampered to the extent that it could not handle the volume of work required of it. Much criticism was directed at the Commission because of its slowness in coming to decisions. In order to correct this, the Commission in Paris suspended its By-Laws, as it had done before at Lisbon, and approved new and more efficient procedures. The new system of voting adopted really amounts to a vote of confidence in the Secretary as well as a vote on the issues involved since conditional votes and affirmative votes are counted as affirmative while only negative votes are counted as negative. This and other modifications of procedure will undoubtedly speed the work of the Commission but they will also restrict its " moral authority ".

---

[1] *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 154.

[2] *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 9.

The American Society of Parasitologists agrees with the Secretary of the Commission that the most effective manner for achieving more authority is to broaden the basis of the authority. At its Paris meeting in 1948 the Commission moved to broaden the basis of its authority by revising the methods by which Commissioners were nominated and by increasing the number of Commissioners. According to their plan nominations for election to the office of Commissioner might be made by learned societies or other qualified institutions. Election to the office of Commissioner was, however, reserved as a prerogative of the Executive Committee of the Commission so that in the final analysis the Commission remains a self-perpetuating body and " its membership cannot be effectively called in question by the general electorate ".

The American Society of Parasitologists invites the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology to consider through its Section on Nomenclature the strengthening of the authority of the International Commission and the International Rules by modifying the procedures of the Commission and/or the method of electing Commissioners so that its membership can be effectively called in question by the general electorate to which it is responsible, namely those scientists who must follow its decisions. It is not recommended that the Commission revert to its previous system, but it is hoped that the advances made at Paris can be extended so that all zoologists may feel that they have a voice in determining the membership of the Commission, and will thereby cease to regard the Commission as functioning both in legislative and judicial capacities and also acting both as judge and jury.

In conclusion the Society reaffirms its vital interest in international co-operation toward the attainment of uniformity and stability in zoological nomenclature.

Signed for the Society by its Committee :

ALLEN McINTOSH
D. H. WENRICH
G. H. WHARTON, *Chairman.*

c.c. Mr. F. Hemming, Secretary,
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

DOCUMENT 64/2

THE PRESENT RULES GOVERNING THE SIZE AND COMPOSITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE, THE ELECTION OF ITS MEMBERS AND ITS PROCEDURE

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

In the document enclosed with its letter of 30th October, 1952 (Document 64/1) the American Society of Parasitologists has asked that consideration should be given at Copenhagen to the question of the procedures of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and/or the method of electing its members with a view to strengthening the authority of the Commission by ensuring that its membership is effectively responsible to the general electorate, namely, those scientists who must follow its decisions. Other aspects of the same question are raised in two documents received from the Nomenclature Committee of the Chicago Natural History Museum (Documents 67/1 and 68/1) and by Dr. Henning Lemche in correspondence which has been reproduced as Document 66/1. Although the subjects raised in these documents are essentially distinct—and for this reason have in the present series been allotted separate Case Numbers—they all fall within the field covered by the document prepared by the American Society of Parasitologists. It is proposed, therefore, that these subjects should be treated as constituent parts of a single whole.

2. Everyone will agree that it is important to ensure that the rules governing the size and composition of the International Commission, the election of its members and its procedure should be those best calculated to secure that the Commission shall function as efficiently as possible and to the general satisfaction of zoologists and palaeontologists. It is important, therefore, that, when these matters come to be discussed at Copenhagen, the discussion should take as its starting point the rules at present in force—all the more so in that some of the documents referred to above show evident misunderstandings regarding the nature of those rules.

3. As Secretary to the International Commission, I have concluded, therefore, that it will be to the general convenience if I set out as briefly as possible what the present rules are and what is their purpose. This I do in the present paper. I deal first with the question of the rules in force to secure that the composition of the International Commission shall be as representative as possible. From this I pass to the question of the rules at present in force in regard to the nomination and election of members of the Commission, a question which, though closely concerned with the measures for securing as representative a character as possible for the International Commission, is nevertheless a quite distinct subject. The next aspect of the present subject to be considered concerns the rules in force for securing the efficient discharge of their duties by the individual Members of the International Commission. Finally, there is the entirely separate subject of the rules governing the procedures for the conduct by the International Commission of its work. It is not possible within the compass of a short paper to give a full description of the procedures of the Commission currently in force. A short section has however been added on this subject, since it is touched upon in the paper submitted by the American Society of Parasitologists.

(1) Problems relating to the size and representative character of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

4. **Regulations in force up to 1913 :** For the limited purpose for which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature was first established, it was considered that a body of five members would suffice. When, however, in 1898 it produced the report which it had been appointed to prepare, the Commission was found not to be unanimous and was criticised as not being sufficiently representative. In consequence, at the Fourth International Congress of Zoology held at Cambridge in that year, it was decided to seek a more representative character for the International Commission by increasing its membership from five to fifteen. A further effect of this change was to increase the number of countries represented on the Commission from five to eight. It is likely however that this latter result was largely accidental and that the elections made in 1898 were on a personal basis. To a considerable extent this would in any case have been inevitable, since membership of (and attendance at) the (Cambridge) Congress at which these elections were made was laid down as a condition of eligibility. The International Commission was converted into a Standing Organ of the Congress at Berlin in 1901 but no changes were then made in its composition. At the next (Sixth) Congress held at Berne in 1904, the system described in paragraph 19 below was introduced under which thereafter one-third of the membership of the Commission completed its service at each of the then-three-yearly Congresses, thus providing a means for renewing the authority of the Commission through the election by the Congress of members to fill the vacancies so created—though, in fact, as experience showed, those vacancies were normally filled by the re-election of the time-expired Commissioners when they were willing to accept re-election. In the period 1910–1913 wastage among the members of the Commission (most of whom had been first elected in 1898) was exceptionally high on account of death and retirements, and accordingly, in order to keep the Commission reasonably up to strength, arrangements were then made for filling these vacancies immediately, the interim elections so made being reported for approval to the next Congress. At that Congress—held at Monaco in 1913—the size of the Commission was increased from fifteen to eighteen.

5. **Practice between the wars :** During the period from 1913 up to the outbreak of war in 1939 the regulations governing the membership of the International Commission remained unchanged. But during that period a conscious effort was made by the Commission—largely under the influence of the late Dr. C. W. Stiles, then its Secretary—to secure for itself a more representative character. This effort took two forms : First, a deliberate attempt was made to increase the international character of the Commission by securing —on vacancies arising—that a larger number of countries should be represented on the Commission. Second, a consistent attempt was made (though not always with success) to ensure that the membership of the Commission should include specialists in each of the main Phyla of the Animal Kingdom.

6. **Difficulties in the period 1913-1939 caused by the small number of Congresses held :** The fact that during the 26-year period 1913–1939 there were only three International Congresses of Zoology threw completely out of gear the arrangements made at Berne in 1904 for the renewal of one-third of the membership of the Commission by each Congress. Accordingly, it was necessary, in order to prevent the Commission from wasting away, to make use consistently of the authority granted by the Ninth (Monaco) Congress for the election by the Commission of new members to fill vacancies as they arose. It cannot be said that the machinery then in existence for this purpose worked satisfactorily, for the lack of any provisions prescribing the principles to be followed in maintaining the membership of the Commission, as regards either the distribution of seats by countries or by types of specialised knowledge, tended, despite the efforts to which I have already referred, to create a stereotyped situation in which the general composition of the Commission showed little change. Elections were made during this period by correspondence among the members of the Commission ; the first stage consisted of a request to members to suggest possible candidates ; the second consisted of a vote on the candidates so suggested. Commonly, the process was very protracted, extending over eighteen months to two years. It is no matter for surprise that under a haphazard system of this kind the results were often not satisfactory. In consequence the average age of zoologists on first election to the Commission was high ; in many cases their term of service was short and their capacity for work much less than it had been earlier in their careers. Once a zoologist had been elected to be a Commissioner, there was a tendency for him to remain one, even after he had ceased—by reason of age or infirmity—to discharge the full burden of work entailed by membership of the Commission.

7. **The Princeton (N.J., U.S.A.) Plan of December 1947 :** Immediately after the close of the late war consideration was given (by correspondence) by the Executive Committee of the International Commission to the question of placing the membership of the International Commission upon a basis that would be both more genuinely international and more genuinely representative in character. It was a desire to pursue these discussions to a point where definite proposals could be formulated for consideration both by the Commission as a whole and, if the Commission agreed, by the next (Thirteenth)

International Congress then due to be held in Paris in 1948 which prompted the then President of the Commission (Dr. Karl Jordan) and the Secretary (Mr. Francis Hemming) to the conclusion that it was desirable that a preliminary meeting should be held between the Secretary, the then Vice-President (Dr. James L. Peters) and as many as possible of the American members of the Commission. This led to the meeting held at Princeton, N.J., U.S.A. in December 1947, at which, in addition to the Vice-President and the Secretary, there were present also the three other United States Commissioners (Professor J. Chester Bradley ; Professor Harold E. Vokes ; Dr. Norman R. Stoll). At that meeting agreement was reached on the submission to the International Commission and the next Congress of a Plan for giving express effect to the principles which should govern the composition of the Commission which had been aimed at—though with only limited success—during the inter-war years. The recommendations then agreed upon were embodied in a document which was submitted to the Commission and the Congress at Paris in July 1948. This paper was later (1950) published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (**3** : 6–15). So far as concerns the size and composition of the International Commission, those recommendations may be summarised as follows :—

(1) that the system under which the International Commission had a fixed membership of eighteen should be replaced by one under which, while the number eighteen was to be retained as the minimum membership, there should be no fixed membership, the number of members at any one time being such number as might be required to give effect to the proposal in (2) below ;

(2) that the Commission should be empowered to elect to its membership a specialist or specialists to represent zoologists and/or palaeontologists of any country in which any considerable amount of zoological work was being conducted where such specialists in that country so desired ;

(3) that elections to the membership of the Commission should be made in such a way as to secure, as far as practicable, that there should be an appropriate balance in the membership of the Commission (a) as between one country and another, and (b) as between different types of knowledge and experience as regards work both on the systematics of the principal divisions of the Animal Kingdom and work in those branches of applied science which are effected by changes in zoological nomenclature.

8. **Decisions taken in Paris in 1948 :** The Princeton Plan summarised in the preceding paragraph were considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris at a meeting held on 21st July, 1948 (Third Meeting of Paris Session). The Official Record of the discussion on this proposal and of the conclusion reached is given on pages 37 to 40 of volume 4

of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (published in 1950). The proposals so submitted were approved by the Commission which decided at the same time to lay down in somewhat greater detail the principles to be observed in electing members to the Commission to secure the desired balance in the membership of the Commission as between different types of knowledge and experience. Further, it was agreed (1950, *ibid.* **4** : 43, point (6)) that in addition to national representatives the membership of the Commission might include any zoologist, irrespective of his nationality, whose election by reason of his special knowledge and experience, would, it was considered, be of value to the work of the Commission.

9. Action taken since 1948 under the decisions reached in Paris : Since the meeting held in Paris in 1948 six elections have been made to the membership of the Commission. These were all of what may be called a routine nature, that is, none of them involved calling to the membership of the Commission zoologists of countries not previously represented on that body : Four of these elections were concerned with making good wastage which had occurred as the result of the recent war ; these were the re-election of the Japanese and Polish Representatives (Professor Esaki and Professor Jaczewski) and the election (on German nomination) of two zoologists to fill the German vacancies on the Commission. The two remaining elections had as their purpose the filling of vacancies created by death (the election of Professor Bonnet *vice* the late Professor Rode as the French Representative) or by retirement (the election of Mr. Riley *vice* Dr. Karl Jordan). It may be noted that several applications for membership of the Commission to represent zoologists of countries not possessing a seat on the Commission have been received and are now pending. Of these we may note particularly applications received from the National Committee on Zoological Nomenclature in Czechoslovakia, from the National Science Council in Israel and, more recently, from the group of institutions speaking for zoologists in Austria. The elections described above raised the total membership of the International Commission at one time to twenty members, advantage thus being taken of the decision taken in Paris to waive the previously existing upper limit of eighteen for the membership of the Commission. Owing to wastage by death three vacancies have since occurred which have not yet been filled. In consequence the total number of Commissioners is now seventeen.

10. The problem created by the multiple representation of the zoologists of certain countries in the membership of the International Commission : The scheme drawn up by the Princeton meeting and subsequently approved in Paris provided for the membership of the International Commission being both genuinely international in character and representative of the various fields of knowledge and experience of importance to zoological nomenclature. There was, however, one thorny question affecting the membership of the Commission which was not dealt with either in the Princeton Plan or later in Paris. This is the problem created by the multiple representation of several countries. The countries concerned are : (1) the United States which have four seats on the Commission ; (2) the United Kingdom, which has three seats, and (3) Germany, which has two seats. This arrangement is of long standing (dating back to well before the Lisbon meeting of 1935) and has been continued on a traditional basis. It may well be thought that the time has come for an express decision regulating this aspect of the composition, for, in the absence of an express decision by the International Congress, the existence of multiple representation on an international body is certainly anomalous, particularly when there are still countries not represented on the Commission, despite the expressed wish of zoologists in those countries for such representation.

(2) Problems involved in the nomination and election of zoologists and palaeontologists to be members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

11. **The procedure for the election of members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature prior to 1939 :** As already explained (paragraphs 4–6) the procedure for the election of members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature up to the year 1939 was of the most haphazard character, no principles having been laid down for guidance in this matter. The procedure adopted for this purpose was also extremely slow-moving and incapable of filling vacancies within a reasonable period of their occurrence. Under this system a vacancy arising in the representation of zoologists who were nationals of one of the Great Powers was normally filled by the election of a zoologist who was of the same nationality as the Commissioner, whose death or retirement had given rise to the vacancy in question. When, however, a vacancy occurred in a seat held by a zoologist belonging to a country, other than one of the Great Powers, it was purely a matter of chance to what country the zoologist elected to succeed him belonged. As the records of the International Commission show, that body—and its members—experienced great difficulty in deciding, unaided from outside, upon suitable nominations ; in general, members of the Commission, while prepared to take soundings as to possible new Commissioners from their own countries, were unwilling to undertake the invidious and inappropriate task of suggesting as candidates zoologists of other countries. Under such a system it was inevitable that the distribution of seats on the Commission as between zoologists of various countries should tend to become stereotyped on the existing pattern. Inevitably, it was a matter of pure chance whether under such a system of election the zoologists elected commanded the full confidence of fellow-workers in their own countries. Inevitably also this method of election tended to secure the election of elderly men or of men in late middle life, for it was not to be expected that, when an outside body, such as the Commission, attempted to select candidates from particular countries, they should select younger men, when better known veterans in those countries were available and naturally, in a sense, formed a much safer choice.

12. **Position between 1939 and 1948 :** The outbreak of war in Europe made it necessary temporarily to entrust to the Executive Committee of certain of the functions formerly exercised by the Commission as a whole. The functions so temporarily transferred included the filling, on an interim basis, of vacancies when these were reported as having occurred in the representation on the Commission of countries with which postal communications were still open. This was deemed to be essential for the purpose of keeping the International Commission in being, having regard to the fact that no one could at that time foresee how long the war would last—for the failure to take similar action during the war of 1914–1918 had left the Commission so weakened by wastage that its rehabilitation in the immediate post-war period had been a matter of great difficulty. In making these provisional interim elections, the Executive Committee abandoned the pre-war practice of the Commission—under which the nomination of candidates had come from within the Commission itself—and in place of that policy looked for assistance and advice in the matter of nominations from leading scientific authorities in the countries in which the vacancies to be filled were situated.

13. **The Princeton (N.J., U.S.A.) Plan of December 1947 :** As in the case of the problems arising in connection with the size and composition of the International Commission (see 7 above), so also the problem of the reform of the rules governing the nomination and election of members of the Commission formed an important part of the business discussed at the meeting between the Vice-President and the three other United States members of the Commission and the Secretary held in December 1947 at Princeton, N.J., U.S.A. That meeting drew up proposals on this subject for submission to the International Commission and the next Congress of Zoology then due to be held some seven months later in Paris. The proposals so agreed upon were embodied in a document which was laid before the Commission for consideration when it met in Paris in July 1948. This was the same document as that in which was embodied the Princeton Plan for the introduction of new provisions relating to the size and composition of the Commission ; as already noted this document was later (1950) published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (**3** : 6–15). The main purpose of this Plan was to extend, and to place on a regular basis, the policy which (as has been explained in paragraph 12 above) had then lately been initiated by the Executive Committee under which responsibility for the nomination of candidates for membership of the Commission was, so far as possible, transferred from the Commission to the principal scientific authority or authorities of the country from which it was desired to obtain a new Commissioner. The main features of the Plan so submitted may be summarised as follows :—

(1) that, whenever it was desired to fill vacancy in the membership of the Commission or to obtain a Commissioner from a country not previously represented on the Commission, the Executive Committee, acting for the Commission, should seek a nomination

from that country, either through the diplomatic channel or direct by application to an appropriate Government Department of the country concerned or to the National Academy of Science or some other leading scientific institution or learned society in that country ;

(2) that, on receipt of a nomination obtained in this way, it should be the duty of the Executive Committee to satisfy itself on such matters as that the election of the candidate proposed would not conflict with the desired balance within the Commission of various types of knowledge and experience (as to which see Point (3) in the summary given in paragraph 7 above, of the portion of the Princeton Plan relating to the principles which should govern the composition of the Commission) ;

(3) that, on the Executive Committee having satisfied itself on the matters referred to in (2) above, it should forthwith elect to the membership of the Commission the zoologist who had been nominated a candidate in the manner indicated in (1) above.

14. **Decisions taken in Paris in 1948 :** The Princeton Plan (summarised in the preceding paragraph) was considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris at a meeting held on 21st July, 1948 (Third Meeting of the Paris Session). The Official Record of the discussion on these proposals and on the conclusion reached is given on pages 40 to 44 of volume 4 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. In the discussion which then took place great stress was laid on the wide diversity of the form of scientific organisation adopted in different countries and on the importance of ensuring that the rules to be adopted for securing nominations from particular countries should be sufficiently elastic to enable account to be taken of the differences referred to above. It was felt (: 41) that by reason of these differences in national organisation a channel of communication which would be an appropriate, and, in some cases, the only appropriate, channel of communication for some countries would be inappropriate or totally impracticable in the case of other countries. For example, the United States zoologists present at this discussion expressed the view that, so far as the United States was concerned, neither an approach to a Government Department nor one to the National Academy would be appropriate. In the discussion on the Princeton Plan the view was expressed also (: 42) that the adoption of the representative principle as the basis on which the membership of the Commission was in future to be built up ought not to be carried to a point at which the Commission would lose control over the selection of persons to be elected as Commissioners, for it was felt that it would not always happen that the consultative method would provide candidates possessed both of high professional distinction and of the personal qualities requisite to make an efficient member of the Commission. In its broad outlines the Princeton Plan was approved by the International Commission (and later by the Section on

Nomenclature and the Congress in Plenary Session). The scheme so approved differed however from the Princeton Plan in respect of those matters where the discussion had shown a desire that that Plan should be modified. Chief among these modifications were: (1) the various possible channels of communication were re-arranged in the reverse order to that suggested in the Princeton Plan, that is, leading scientific institutions and learned societies were placed first in the list, Government Agencies and the diplomatic channel being placed last; (2) the duties relating to the scrutiny by the Executive Committee of the Commission of nominations submitted through the channels referred to in (1) above were elaborated, (3) a provision was inserted authorising the Executive Committee itself to elect to the membership of the Commission, as a non-territorial member, any zoologist, irrespective of nationality, where it was satisfied that, by reason of the special knowledge and experience possessed by the zoologist in question, his election would be of value to the work of the Commission; (4) on the occurrence of a casual vacancy in the membership of the Commission, the Executive Committee, instead of being required (as proposed in the Princeton Plan) to consult national authorities in the same way as that proposed on the occasion of the election of a national representative for a country not previously represented on the Commission, should have the option either to do so or itself to nominate and elect a zoologist of the country concerned to fill the vacancy in question.

15. **The flaw in the plan for securing nominations decided upon in Paris in 1948 :** The decisions taken in Paris in 1948 for regulating the method to be followed in obtaining nominations of candidates for election to the membership of the Commission suffer from one serious defect arising out of a departure then decided upon from the suggestions which had been submitted in the Princeton Plan. That Plan recognised that in different countries forms of scientific organisation differed so much that the rule to be adopted would need to provide a choice of such channels, thereby ensuring that in any given case there should be an appropriate channel available. It was an essential feature of that Plan that for any given country there should be one channel of consultation and one channel only, that channel being through the diplomatic channel or direct through a Government Department of the country concerned or to the National Academy of Science of the country concerned or to some leading scientific institution or learned society in that country, whichever might, in any given case, be considered the most appropriate. The decision in Paris to place scientific institutions and learned societies first in the list and the clear intimation by the United States zoologists present that, so far as their country was concerned, neither the diplomatic channel nor a Government Agency nor the National Academy of Science would be regarded by United States zoologists as appropriate channels of communication broke the unity of advice which it had been the object of the Princeton Plan to secure. The result has been that —to take a practical and recent experience—there is now no means open to the Executive Committee to secure a single nomination from the United States to fill a United States vacancy. Accordingly, in this—and any similar case which might arise—the Executive Committee can only apply to the

leading museums and learned societies for nominations—a method which cannot be expected to provide the Executive Committee with a unanimous recommendation. Thus, in cases of this sort it has—under the Paris decisions—proved impossible to secure the prime object sought by the Princeton Plan, namely, to place squarely upon the shoulders of zoologists and palaeontologists in every country the responsibility for providing an agreed nomination of a candidate to fill a vacancy in the national representation of that country on the International Commission. In the case of the United States, it is clear from the documents submitted by the American Society of Parasitologists (Document 64/1) and from the Nomenclature Committee of the Chicago Natural History Museum (Document 67/1) that at least some specialists are not satisfied with the present regulations in regard to the procedure for securing nominations for candidates for election to the Commission and it is much to be hoped that it will be found possible to devise means acceptable to United States specialists which will place upon themselves the duty of providing an agreed nomination to fill any United States vacancy on the Commission, whenever such arises, in place of the present system by which, under the Paris decision, it falls to the Executive Committee of the Commission to undertake the inappropriate and invidious task of itself making a choice from a number of competing nominations from institutions in the United States.

16. Reason for the transfer in 1948 of the duty of electing members of the Commission from the total membership of the Commission to the Executive Committee of that body : In its communication on the subject of the organisation of the Commission (Document 64/1) the American Society of Parasitologists calls in question the wisdom of the decision taken in Paris in 1948 to transfer from the general membership of the Commission to the Executive Committee of that body the responsibility of electing members of the Commission. It may perhaps be convenient, therefore, to note in this connection that this change as conceived in the Princeton Plan where it was first suggested, formed part of the general purpose of that Plan to transfer as much as possible of the responsibility in connection with the appointment of new Commissioners to the zoologists and palaeontologists of the country concerned, retaining for the Commission only certain duties of scrutiny, together with the actual right of election. The scrutiny of the qualifications of candidates would, it was hoped and expected, raise no issue for discussion, except on the rarest of occasions and the actual act of election in the case of a candidate nominated by the fellow-workers of his own country would, after the completion of the prescribed scrutiny of credentials, be purely formal. It was accordingly considered that the duties in connection with the election of proposed Commissioners still to be retained might with advantage be discharged by the Executive Committee rather than by the full membership of the Commission, for (1) if the prescribed scrutiny were in any given case to raise an issue calling for consideration, the situation resulting would inevitably be delicate and one best handled by a small body such as the Commission's Executive Committee, while (2) in any case where no issue arose out of the scrutiny, it would be an empty and pointless formality to remit the formal act of election to the entire membership of the

Commission, having regard to the fact that under the scheme any specialist who had been duly nominated by the national authority in his country and as regards whom no point arose on the prescribed scrutiny should be elected without question to the membership of the Commission.

17. **The Chicago Museum's proposal that the names of candidates for election to the membership of the International Commission should be subject to public advertisement :** In a brief communication reproduced in the present series as Document 67/1 the Committee on Nomenclature suggest (1) that definite standards of eligibility be adopted for nominees to vacant positions in the Commission, and (2) that lists of such nominees should be published by the International Commission at least three months before each Congress. The proposal does not refer to elections made by the Commission during inter-Congress periods, but, as it is on these occasions that for the most part zoologists are first elected to the Commission to fill vacancies arising from death and other causes, it may be assumed that the proposal relates so such elections also. This proposal is clearly designed to ensure the highest obtainable standard of personal distinction among the members of the International Commission and the widest degree of acceptability that can be obtained for candidates for election to the Commission. Every one will agree with these general purposes, and the only subject for discussion will therefore be whether these particular measures are well adapted to secure the end in view. As Secretary to the International Commission, I am of the opinion that these proposals are not so adapted. Evidence from every side suggests a growing desire among zoologists and palaeontologists to have a share in the selection of the fellow-countryman who is to serve as their representative on the International Commission. Further, as might have been expected, the foregoing tendency is accompanied by a growing sensitiveness of outside—i.e. from the standpoint of the country concerned, foreign—intervention in the matter of the selection of national representatives to serve on the Commission. I feel bound to say that, in my view, the particular proposals now under consideration would cut right across the system now in process of being built up under which the responsibility for nominating candidates for election to the Commission is passing into the hands of the zoologists and palaeontologists of the countries concerned through the development of agreed channels for the submission of nominations from the appropriate scientific authorities in the countries concerned. In my view, this system, better than any other, should lead to the nomination from each country of a candidate of high personal distinction and enjoying also the confidence and esteem of fellow workers in his own country.

(3) Problem involved in providing for the due discharge of their duties by individual members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

18. **Suggestions received in relation to the proposed adoption of provisions designed to ensure the due discharge of their duties by individual Commissioners :** In a paper published in the present series as Document 68/1 the Committee

on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum has raised the question of introducing provisions designed to secure the due discharge of their duties by individual Commissioners and has put forward two suggestions by way of alternatives ; under the first of these suggestions the number of terms of service as a member of the Commission permissible to any person (other than the Secretary) would be limited to three, while under the second a compulsory retirement age would be established for members of the Commission. The need for an effective system under which members of the Commission would be required to account for their stewardship to the general body of zoologists is referred to also by the American Society of Parasitologists in the paper which they have submitted (Document 64/1) but no definite suggestions are put forward by the Society. Everyone will agree that the above is an important subject as regards which adequate safeguards are necessary and a periodical review of those safeguards desirable. In order to facilitate such a review I give in the present Section a description of the provisions actually in force today—as to which the foregoing documents disclose certain misunderstandings—and explain how it came about that those provisions were considered better suited to secure the desired end than other suggestions which had been previously considered.

19. **Arrangements in force up to 1948 :** Prior to the meeting of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in 1948, the membership of the International Commission, which was then limited in size to eighteen members, was divided into three " Classes ", each elected for a term of nine years. It was so arranged when this system was introduced that one of these Classes completed its term of service every three years. At that time the International Congress of Zoology met normally at three-yearly intervals and the retirement of these Classes coincided with these meetings, thus making it possible for the filling of a new Class (of six Commissioners) to be conducted at the meeting of the Congress and subject to its approval. Where a vacancy arose during an inter-Congress period—as happened occasionally through the death or resignation of Commissioners—the zoologist then elected to the Commission was placed in the " Class " in the membership of the Commission which had fallen vacant. Interim elections, so made, were subject to approval by the next following Congress. Under this system it might happen—and did sometimes happen—that a zoologist was elected to a Class which had very nearly completed its nine-year term of service and, in consequence, had to submit himself for re-election very shortly after he had become a member of the Commission.

20. **Objections to the pre-1948 system :** After 1913 the system described above lost such merits as it may orginally have possessed, for never after that year did the International Congress meet in a year which corresponded with the termination of the period of service of one of the Classes in the membership of the Commission—and, indeed, it only once met with so short an interval from the preceding Congress as three years. In order to secure that part of the membership of the Commission should complete its service at each Congress,

whenever it might be held, an arrangement was made during the inter-war years under which the Class in the membership of the Commission which had served the longest was deemed to have completed its term on the last days of the next Congress, even though it had not completed the full nine-year term for which it had been elected. The system of nine-year Classes was, however, maintained, although it now served no useful purpose and its perpetuation merely involved unnecessary correspondence and waste of time during inter-Congress periods, since the whole proceeding was an empty formality.

21. **The present system introduced in 1949 :** The question of introducing reforms designed to secure a more effective system for the periodical renewal of the membership of the International Commission was discussed towards the end of the war by the Executive Committee by correspondence, and later in December 1947 at the meeting held at Princeton, N.J., U.S.A., which was attended by all the United States members of the Commission and myself as Secretary. At this meeting recommendations were drawn up (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 6–15) for consideration when the International Commission and the International Congress met in July 1948. These recommendations were brought forward for discussion at the Third Meeting of the International Commission during its Session held in Paris (Meeting held on 21st July, 1948). For the Official Record of the conclusion then reached, see Conclusion 3 of the foregoing meeting (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 44–46). Shortly, the decision then taken (which was later approved by the Congress) was (1) that the obsolete system of Classes should be abolished, (2) that in future the names of members of the Commission should be placed on a list arranged in accordance with the order in which they had been elected to the Commission or, if they were serving a second or later term, the date on which they were re-elected or last re-elected to the Commission, (3) that at each meeting of the Congress one-third of the members of the Commission should vacate their position as such, the members in question being those at the head of the list referred to in (2) above. This change was accompanied by the further reform described in paragraph 23 below designed to secure the removal from the membership of the Commission of any zoologist who might have failed to discharge the duties of his office.

22. **Question of the introduction of an age-limit for the compulsory retirement of members of the International Commission :** In the later part of the war consideration was given by the Executive Committee of the International Commission to the question whether it would be desirable to introduce a compulsory age-limit on attaining which members of the Commission would automatically vacate their position and would be ineligible for re-election. There was full agreement that some reform was needed in order to prevent the recurrence in the future of cases such as had occurred in the past where a zoologist who was a member of the Commission had become, by reason of age or infirmity, unfit to perform his duties but out of the high regard and

esteem in which he was personally held had been permitted to retain his membership of the Commission. In at least one case also a quite young zoologist had been elected to be a Commissioner but being, as it appeared, unfitted for membership of a body working mainly by correspondence, had never once voted upon a proposed *Opinion* submitted during his term of service. On the other hand, there had been shining examples of men—of whom the late Dr. Leonard Stejneger of Washington, D.C., and Dr. Karl Jordan of Tring were pre-eminent—who far into old age had served with the utmost distinction, and had indeed discharged their duties as members of the Commission, including acting as consultants on difficult questions involving detailed bibliographical investigations, in a manner unequalled by most of their younger colleagues. It was felt by the Executive Committee that a compulsory age for retirement would be open to considerable objection in that it would deprive the Commission prematurely of outstanding personalities whose retirement would be a serious loss. On the other hand, it was considered that a qualified retirement-age (that is, an age-limit at which retirement would be compulsory, except where some authorised body decided otherwise) would be of doubtful utility, for the task of deciding whether a given Commissioner on attaining the age-limit, should be invited to serve for a further period would clearly be most invidious, whatever the body to which the duty of taking such decisions might be ; the likelihood, it was felt, was that a provision of this kind would quickly become almost a dead letter, the probability being that the authorising body would escape from its difficulties by granting renewals in the majority of cases. It was concluded, therefore, that it would be better to seek some alternative method for weeding out of the membership of the Commission any zoologist who failed to discharge his duties.

23. **Procedure adopted in 1948 for the purpose of ensuring the due discharge of their duties by members of the International Commission :** In the preceding paragraph I have explained how it was that in 1948 it was decided to seek some way, other than by instituting an age-limit for retirement, of securing the due performance of their duties by the members of the International Commission. The solution adopted was a provision under which a member of the Commission would in future forfeit his position as such if on five successive occasions he failed to register his vote on the drafts of *Declarations* or *Opinions* submitted for decision, save where he could produce a satisfactory explanation (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 49, Conclusion 4(b)). Other reforms instituted at the same time were :—(a) a provision under which, where a member of the Commission, by reason of going on a scientific expedition or for some other cause, knew that he would be unable to discharge his duties for a considerable period, leave of absence might be granted to him and an Alternate Member temporarily appointed in his place (1950, *ibid.* **4** : 48–49, Conclusion 4(a)), and (b) a provision for the automatic removal of a zoologist from membership of the Commission in the event of his incurring any of a number of specified disabilities (1950, *ibid.* **4** : 49, Conclusion 4(c)).

(4) The procedure of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

24. Comment by the American Society of Parasitologists on the procedure of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : In the document submitted by the American Society of Parasitologists (reproduced in the present series as Document 64/1) the Society raises the question whether the present procedure of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for dealing with individual nomenclatorial problems is the best suited for the purpose. At the same time the Society comments upon the decision taken in Paris in 1948 for the treatment to be accorded to votes by individual Commissioners, when those votes are given conditionally. It is clear that on both these points the Society is not fully informed as to what is the present procedure of the International Commission, and, as it is desirable that zoologists and palaeontologists generally should be fully aware of the procedure adopted in regard to these matters, it has been judged useful to add to the present paper the following short Section explaining the nature of the procedure actually in force.

25. Procedure followed in reaching decisions on individual nomenclatorial questions up to 1948 : In the period from 1907 (when the power to give decisions on individual nomenclatorial questions was first conferred upon the International Commission) to 1936, the Commission possessed no funds of its own and had no means at its disposal for bringing before the zoological public proposals on matters submitted to it for decision. Communication between the Secretary and the members of the Commission itself in regard to such matters was conducted through the circulation of carbon typescripts. It was largely to rectify these weaknesses in organisation that it was decided in 1943 to establish a serial publication—the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* —for the publication of applications submitted to the Commission. A further purpose underlying the establishment of the *Bulletin* was the provision of a medium for the publication of comments received from interested specialists in regard to applications published in earlier Parts of that serial. The long period required for printing in the immediate post-war period and other causes made it possible by the time of the Paris meeting in 1948 to publish in the *Bulletin* a part only of the arrears of applications which had accumulated during the war period, and it was in the hope of making a substantial inroad into those arrears that at Paris decisions were taken by the Commission on a considerable number of applications which had not been published in the *Bulletin*. This partial reversion to the pre-war system was recognised at the time as being an exceptional measure designed to overcome a special difficulty.

26. Procedure followed since 1948 in reaching decisions on individual nomenclatorial questions : The period following the Paris meetings was occupied entirely with the preparation and publication of the records of those meetings until about the middle of the year 1950, and it was not until the spring of 1951 that it was possible to commence the publication of a volume (volume 2) of the *Bulletin* devoted to applications relating to individual zoological names. From that time onwards the publication of such applications

—after the completion of volume 2, in volumes 6 and 9—proceeded steadily, save for an interval in the winter of 1951–1952 when work was suspended in order to permit of the preparation of a special volume (vol. 7) of the *Bulletin* devoted to certain major nomenclatorial problems affecting the text of the *Règles* which had been remitted by the Paris Congress for consideration by the Copenhagen Congress in 1953 and on which it was desired to obtain advice from interested specialists. The volumes of the *Bulletin* dealing with problems relating to individual names contained also the comments received from specialists on applications published in earlier Parts. Owing to the period of six months prescribed by the Paris Congress as the interval to be observed after the publication of applications and the taking of a decision thereon it was some time after the commencement of the publication of volume 2 of the *Bulletin* before the Commission was in a position to start voting (by post) on the applications in question. Prior to the start of voting consideration was given to the form of Voting Paper to be employed. Ultimately a standard form of Voting Paper was evolved which, after stating the date by which votes are returnable, (1) gives a bibliographical reference to the place in the *Bulletin* in which the application has been published, (2) reports, in Plenary Powers applications, the action taken to " advertise " the application under the prescribed procedure, (3) gives particulars of all comments received in regard to the application with bibliographical references to such of those applications as have been received in sufficient time to be published in the *Bulletin*, (4) in some cases, gives a brief comment such as a note calling attention to evidence contained in the application itself as to the views of interested specialists or noting that a decision on the case in question is desired in connection with the preparation of some book (e.g. the international *Treatise on Invertebrate Palaeontology*), and (5) calls for a vote on the application submitted. In cases where no opposition to the application has been received from any quarter or where the support is large and the opposition small, Members of the Commission are asked to vote for, or against the proposal submitted by the applicant. Where however, it is clear that opinion on the issue involved is substantially divided, Members of the Commission are asked to vote for one of two specified affirmative proposals ; the first of these is the proposal submitted by the applicant, the second a proposal which is the exact opposite of that asked for by the applicant and represents, therefore, a decision rejecting that proposal.

27. It is important that zoologists and palaeontologists generally should be fully aware of the strictly objective character of the procedure adopted by the Commission in voting upon applications submitted to it. The foregoing explanation of the form of voting in use is accordingly supplemented by the reproduction *in extenso* of two Voting Papers issued in 1952. Of these the first, which is V.P.(52)47 (i.e. the 47th Voting Paper issued in 1952), is concerned with certain names in the Order Mallophaga (Class Insecta) in which the use of the Plenary Powers was asked for, where (a) the prescribed advertisement procedure had elicited no objections, (b) attention was drawn to the evidence contained in the application of a canvas carried out by the applicant of the views of fellow-workers which showed that of the fourteen workers concerned

twelve supported the application and two dissented from it on the ground that they were opposed to any use of the Plenary Powers. In this case, as will be seen, the Members of the Commission were invited to vote for, or against, the application submitted. The second of the Voting Papers reproduced in *facsimile* is V.P.(53)4, which is concerned with the highly controversial case of the application of the names *Crangon* and *Alpheus* as published by Weber in 1795 and by Fabricius in 1798 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). In this case it will be seen that after an enumeration of the expressions of opinion received for, and against, the proposal submitted by the applicant, and after attention had been drawn to surveys of the literature furnished by the applicant and by a leading zoologist opposed to the proposal submitted, the Members of the Commission were asked to vote for one or other of two specified affirmative proposals. The first of these (styled Alternative "A") embodied the proposal submitted by the applicant, the second (styled Alternative " B ") represented the decision required in the event of the rejection of the application submitted.

28. Provision for conditional voting approved in Paris in 1948 : The American Society of Parasitologists express (in Document 64/1) some apprehension regarding the decision taken in Paris in 1948 that in the counting of votes cast by Commissioners in postal voting on cases of individual names and kindred matters any vote cast conditionally (that is, in any case where a Commissioner states that he is willing to cast his vote in whichever direction is favoured by the majority of the Commission) is to be treated as an affirmative vote (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 50–51). It may therefore be appropriate to explain the origin of the foregoing proposal. It was this : In the period prior to 1936, Commissioners who failed to vote often excused themselves for their failure to perform the duties of their office on the ground that they possessed no personal knowledge of the merits of the application in question. Failure to vote on cases submitted constituted a severe handicap to the work of the Commission at that time since under the regulations then in force, even the simplest proposal required for its acceptance not only a majority of the votes cast in the Commission but also a number of votes greater than half the total membership of the Commission. Although this latter difficulty was removed in Paris, it was then nevertheless considered improper that a member of the Commission should be free to shelter himself completely by excuses of the foregoing kind. It was considered that if on conscientious grounds a Commissioner felt unable to vote in either sense on any given proposal, it would be reasonable to give him the opportunity, should he so desire, to discharge his duty by expressing a willingness to associate himself with the majority opinion of the Commission on the case concerned. In considering this matter, the Commission felt that the adoption of this procedure by a Commissioner could reasonably be held as clearing him from the charge of neglect of the duties of his office and of the risk of being removed from his office for failure to discharge those duties. In actual practice very little use has been made of the provision here under consideration, for out of the 969 votes cast by Commissioners in 1952 on the sixty cases submitted for vote, only six were cast under the special provision discussed above.

ANNEXE 1 TO DOCUMENT 64/2

Reproduction of Voting Paper V.P.(52)47 relating to certain generic names in the Order Mallophaga (Class Insecta)

(1) Front Page of Voting Paper V.P.(52)47

Z.N.(S.) 343

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

CALL FOR A VOTE

ON THE APPLICATION RELATING TO THE NAME Lipeurus, Colpocephalum, and Gyropus, all of Nitzsch, 1818 (Class Insecta, Order Mallophaga)

Letter of Transmittal

Dear Commissioner,

You will find overleaf a Voting Paper on the above application. You are asked to complete this and return it to me as soon as possible. The prescribed period within which Votes may be given by post is **three months** calculated from the date on which the Voting Paper concerned is issued from the Office of the Commission. In the present case the latest date by which your Vote should reach this Office is therefore 15th August, 1952.

2. I have verified independently the factual presentation of this application to the best of my ability.

3. I give below, for information, the following brief note on the present case.

Yours sincerely,
(*Signed*) FRANCIS HEMMING,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park, LONDON, N.W.1, England.

Date of despatch : 15 May 1952.

Notes relating to the present case

1. *Application published:* Bull. 6:54-60 (G. H. E. Hopkins)

2. Compliance with the prescribed advertisement procedure: This case, which involves the possible use of the Commission's plenary powers, has been duly advertised in the prescribed serial publications and

Continuation of Front Page of V.P.(52)47)

in addition also in certain other zoological and entomological such publications. No objection has been received.

3. Support received: Support has been received from Ernst Mayr (American Museum of Natural History, New York) (6:210) as an ornithologist.

4. Comment: It will be recalled (6:59) that, before this application was submitted to the Commission, the problems at issue were the subject of discussion and correspondence between all the available leading workers in the Mallophaga. Of the fourteen specialists who took part in these discussions twelve gave it their support, while two dissented on the ground that they were opposed to any use of the plenary powers. The names of the fourteen specialists concerned are given on the page of the application cited above.

(2) Back Page of Voting Paper V.P.(52)47

V.P. (1952) 47

VOTING PAPER

I vote {for / against}* the proposal relating to the names Lipeurus, Colpocephalum and Gyropus, all of Nitzsch, 1818, as set out in Points (1) to (5) at the foot of page 59 and on page 60 of Volume 6 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature,* subject to the correction of the two printers' errors on 60 noted at the foot of the present Voting Paper.

Signature of Commissioner :..............................

Date of signature :..............................

***Note.—Delete whichever of the alternative words is inappropriate.**

IMPORTANT NOTICE

1. This Vote, should be completed and returned as soon as possible to Francis Hemming, Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England. The latest date by which this Voting Paper should be received by the Secretary is 15th August, 1952.
2. Commissioners residing outside Europe are requested to reply by airmail.
3. Commissioners are reminded that failure to vote on three successive occasions renders a Commissioner liable to removal from his Office as such.

Correction of two printers' errors: Page 60, lines 5 and 6:

In each case the date of the specific name is incorrectly stated to be ''1818''; the correct date is ''1838''. The names in question are therefore Colpocephalum zebra Burmeister, 1838, and Gyropus ovalis Burmeister, 1838.

ANNEXE 2 TO DOCUMENT 64/2

Reproduction of Voting Paper V.P.(53)4 relating to the generic names "Crangon" and "Alpheus" of Weber (1795) and Fabricius (1798) (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) respectively

(1) Front Page of Voting Paper V.P.(53)4

Z.N.(S.) 231

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

CALL FOR A VOTE

ON THE APPLICATION RELATING TO THE NAME Crangon Fabricius, 1798, Alpheus Fabricius, 1798, Crangon Weber, 1795 and Alpheus Weber, 1795 (Cl. Crustacea, Order Decapoda)

Letter of Transmittal

Dear Commissioner,

You will find overleaf a Voting Paper on the above application. You are asked to complete this and return it to me as soon as possible. The prescribed period within which Votes may be given by post is **three months** calculated from the date on which the Voting Paper concerned is issued from the Office of the Commission. In the present case the latest date by which your Vote should reach this Office is therefore 2nd April, 1953.

2. I have verified independently the factual presentation of this application to the best of my ability.

3. I give below, for information, the following brief note on the present case.

Yours sincerely,
(*Signed*) FRANCIS HEMMING,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park, LONDON, N.W.1, England.

Date of despatch : 2nd January, 1953.

Notes relating to the present case

1. *Application published:* Bull. 2:69-72, 79-80 (L. B. Holthuis)

2. Compliance with the prescribed advertisement procedure: This case, which involves the possible use of the Commission's plenary powers, has been

(Continuation of Front Page of V.P.(53)4)

duly advertised in the prescribed serial publications and in addition also in certain other zoological serial publications.

3. Comments received:-As was to be expected in view of the deep division of practice in the use of these names by specialists, numerous letters have been received in regard to this application, some supporting it, others opposing it. The comments so received are summarised on Sheet No. 1 annexed.

(2) Back Page of Voting Paper V.P.(53)4

V.P.(1953) 4

VOTING PAPER

I vote* for the proposal set out in the annexed Sheet No. 2:-
ALTERNATIVE ''A'' (Dr. Holthuis' proposal),

OR

ALTERNATIVE ''B'' (action required if Dr. Holthuis' proposal were to be rejected).

Signature of Commissioner :..

Date of signature : ....

***Note.—Delete whichever of the alternative** proposals you desire to reject.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

1. This Vote, should be completed and returned as soon as possible to Francis Hemming, Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England. The latest date by which this Voting Paper should be received by the Secretary is 2nd April, 1953.
2. Commissioners residing outside Europe are requested to reply by airmail.
3. Commissioners are reminded that failure to vote on three successive occasions renders a Commissioner liable to removal from his Office as such.

(First Enclosure to Voting Paper V.P.(53)4)

Sheet No. 1

Z.N.(S.) 231

Comments on the Alpheus/Crangon case

Nature of the problem: This application is concerned to secure a settlement of a long-standing difference of usage of the generic name Crangon and associated names. Up till 1904 the name Crangon, attributed to Fabricius, 1798, was universally applied to the Common Shrimp of Europe, while the name Alpheus, also attributed to Fabricius, 1798, was similarly used for Snapping Shrimps. In 1904 the late Miss Mary Rathbun drew attention to the Nomenclator entomologicus Fabricii of Weber published in 1795, in which the name Crangon was used for a species of Snapping Shrimp. Miss Rathbun at the same time pointed out that the name Alpheus Fabricius, 1798 was a junior homonym of Alpheus Weber, 1795, which latter name she made in 1930 an objective junior synonym of Cancer Linnaeus, 1758, by selecting Cancer pagurus Linnaeus, 1758, to be its type species. Miss Rathbun applied to the Common Shrimp the name Crago Lamarck, 1800 (that being the oldest available name therefor if the name Crangon Fabricius, 1798, could not be used for it). In 1910 there was published the Commission's Opinion 17, in which it ruled that, other things being equal, the generic names in Weber's Nomenclator of 1795 were available nomenclatorially. Gradually, Miss Rathbun's use of the names Crangon Weber and Crago Lamarck won considerable acceptance, but many workers refused to make the change. In consequence there has been-and still is-a complete lack of uniformity of nomenclatorial usage in this field.

2. Survey of current usage: Attention is particularly drawn to two papers, one by Dr. Fenner Chace (Washington) (Bull. 2:75-78), the other by Dr. L. B. Holthuis (Bull. 2:79-80), which survey the present state of usage of these names. These papers, being written by specialists who take opposing views of the solution which it is desirable should be reached in the present case, are particularly valuable, in that they afford to the Commission an agreed appreciation of the

(Continuation of First Enclosure to Voting Paper V.P.(53)4)

(*Continuation of Sheet No.* 1)

position. As will be seen from those papers (1) an important weight of support attaches to both the contending usages; (2) a majority rejects the Weber names in favour of the later Fabrician names; the size of this majority depends (as will be seen) upon the extent to which the survey is restricted to work by specialists in this group, being the narrower if account is taken only of the work of active Decapod specialists.

3. Support received for Dr. Holthuis' proposal: Support for Dr. Holthuis' proposals has been received from the following:-

(1) Poul Heegaard (University of Copenhagen) (Bull. 2:73)

(2) The late Robert Gurney (England) (Bull. 2:74)

(3) Marie V. Lebour (The Laboratory, Citadel Hill, Plymouth, England) (Bull. 2:340)

(4) A. B. Needler (Fisheries Research Board of Canada, St. Andrews, N.B., Canada) (Bull. 2:342)

(5) N. Nouvel (Faculte des Sciences, Toulouse, France) (Bull. 2:342-343)

(6) Heinrich Balss (Zoologisches Staatssammlung, Munich, Germany) (Bull. 2:344)

(7) E. Sollaud (Universite de Lyon, Faculte des Sciences, Lyon, France) (Bull. 2:344)

(8) Ricardo Zariquiey (Barcelona, Spain) (Bull. 6:72)

(9) R. Ph. Dollfus (Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris) (Bull. 6:181)

(10) I. Gordon (British Museum (Natural History), London) (Bull. 6:183)

4. Objections to Dr. Holthuis' proposal received: Objection to Dr. Holthuis' proposals has been received from the following:-

(1) E. Fenner Chace Jr. (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.) (Bull. 2:75-78)

(Continuation of First Enclosure to Voting Paper V.P.(53)4)

(Continuation of Sheet No. 1)

(2) Albert H. Banner (University of Hawaii, Honolulu) (Bull. 2:74-75)

(3) Waldo L. Schmitt (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.) (Bull. 2:340)

(4) Frank A. McNeill (Australian Museum, Sydney, New South Wales) (Bull. 2:341)

(5) Charles H. Blake (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.) (Bull. 6:182-183)

(6) Herbert M. Hale (The South Australian Museum, Adelaide, South Australia) (Bull. 6:181)

(7) Belle A. Stevens (University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, U.S.A.) (Bull. 6:184)

5. Procedure adopted in presenting the present case for vote: In view of the marked differences of opinion which have been expressed by specialists as to the decision which it is desirable should be taken in the present case, I feel that, instead of voting ''yes'' or ''no'' on Dr. Holthuis' proposal, it would be more convenient for the Commission to vote on two alternative proposals, namely: (1) Alternative ''A'' (Dr. Holthuis' proposal); (2) Alternative ''B'' (rejection of Dr. Holthuis' proposal). I have agreed with Dr. Holthuis the form of the decision which would be needed if his proposal were to be rejected by the Commission. The Voting Paper now submitted has accordingly been prepared on the foregoing basis.

(Signed) FRANCIS HEMMING,

Secretary to the Commission.

28th December, 1952.

(Second Enclosure to Voting Paper V.P.(53)4)

Sheet No. 2

ALTERNATIVE ‘‘A’’ (Dr. L. B. Holthuis)

(1) Under the plenary powers the generic names *Alpheus* Weber, 1795, and *Crangon* Weber, 1795, are hereby suppressed for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy. (2) The following names are hereby placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*: (a) *Alpheus* Fabricius, 1798 (masculine) (type species, by selection by Latreille (1810): *Alpheus avarus* Fabricius, 1798); (b) *Crangon* Fabricius, 1798 (feminine) (type species, by absolute tautonymy: *Cancer crangon* Linnaeus, 1758). (3) The following names are hereby placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*: (a) *Alpheus* Weber, 1795, and (b) *Crangon* Weber, 1795, (both as suppressed under (1) above), (c) *Crago* Lamarck, 1801 (an objective junior synonym of *Crangon* Fabricius, 1798). (4) The following names are hereby placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*: (a) *avarus* Fabricius, 1798 (as published in the combination *Alpheus avarus*) (trivial name of type species of *Alpheus* Fabricius, 1798); (b) *crangon* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Cancer crangon*) (trivial name of type species of *Crangon* Fabricius, 1798).

ALTERNATIVE ‘‘B’’ (Rejection of Dr. Holthuis’ proposal)

(1) The application for the suppression under the plenary powers of *Alpheus* Weber, 1795, and of *Crangon* Weber, 1795, is hereby rejected. (2) The following names are hereby placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*: (a) *Crangon* Weber, 1795 (feminine) (type species, by monotypy: *Astacus malabaricus* Fabricius, 1775); (b) *Crago* Lamarck, 1800 (masculine) (type species, by monotypy: *Cancer crangon* Linnaeus, 1758). (3) The following names are hereby placed on the

(Continuation of Second Enclosure to Voting Paper V.P.(53)4)

(Continuation of Sheet No. 2)

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology: (a) *Alpheus* Weber, 1795 (an objective junior synonym of *Cancer* Linnaeus, 1758, having the same species, *Cancer pagurus* Linnaeus, 1758, as its type species, that species having been so selected for *Cancer* Linnaeus by Latreille (1810) and for *Alpheus* Weber by Rathbun (1930)); (b) *Alpheus* Fabricius, 1798 (an objective junior homonym of *Alpheus* Weber, 1795); (c) *Crangon* Fabricius, 1798 (an objective junior homonym of *Alpheus* Weber, 1795); (c) *Crangon* Fabricius, 1798 (an objective junior homonym of *Crangon* Weber, 1795). (4) The following names are hereby placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology:* (a) *crangon* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Cancer crangon*) (trivial name of type species of *Crago* Lamarck, 1800); (b) *malabaricus* Fabricius, 1775, (as published in the combination *Astacus malabaricus*) (trivial name of type species of *Crangon* Weber, 1795); (c) *avarus* Fabricius, 1798 (as published in the combination *Alpheus avarus*).

CASE NO. 65

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE AND THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY : PROPOSED MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING ARRANGEMENTS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)64)

DOCUMENT 65/1

By the **NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY**

Letter, dated 27th July, 1952, from
Mr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman

I enclose reports (in duplicate) on the remaining five nomenclatorial problems that were submitted to ballot of the entire membership of the Society of Systematic Zoology during Dr. Charles D. Michener's chairmanship of the nomenclature committee of that society.

These reports * are entitled as follows :

. . . .

(3) " Interrelationship of International Congress and International Commission ".

. . . .

This material is transmitted to you for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, with the request that the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be notified of the stand of the society on the problems concerned, and that, where rules or opinions are involved, this stand be considered in connection with the proposed revisions of the *Règles*.

---

* The other reports here referred to, which deal with different subjects, have been published at the appropriate parts in the present volume.

Enclosure to Document 65/1

Interrelationship of the International Commission and the International Congress

During Dr. Charles D. Michener's chairmanship of the nomenclature committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology, the following ballot was distributed to the members of that society :

(1) I would prefer to have the Commission divorced from the Congress if a practical plan can be devised for operating the Commission in some other way.

(2) I approve the *status quo*, final authority for the Commission's actions resting with the Congress.

According to Dr. Michener's tabulation of the votes cast, the result was as follows :

(1) 124 (Commission divorced from Congress).

(2) 140 (Congress to retain final authority for Commission's actions).

In view of these returns, it is recommended that the International Congress of Zoology retain final authority for the actions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

Dated, July 27, 1952.

W. I. FOLLETT,

Chairman, Nomenclature Committee
Society of Systematic Zoology.

CASE NO. 66

QUESTION OF THE SIZE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)60)

DOCUMENT 66/1

(1) Letter, dated 24th July, 1952, from Dr. HENNING LEMCHE (*Universitetets Zoologisk Museum, Copenhagen*) to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

There was a single question settled in Paris which at once I decided to place under discussion again at the next Congress. I hereby ask that it is made part of the Agenda. It is the question of the *Number of Commissioners.*

It is an old experience that the larger a Commission, the more difficult it is to handle. In the present case, our Secretary has such an iron-energy that he will be able to manage even a very large Commission, but there will come a time when—for the reason of age or other work—he can not continue. Then, we are to find another Secretary, and the larger the Commission, the more difficult will be the task he has to take over. So, we *must* prevent the Commission in growing too large. It will always be much more difficult to reduce the number than it is to increase it.

The Secretary's idea of representatives for all interested bodies—all its idealistic background unchallenged—cannot be carried through in practice. It is quite correct that the members of the Commission have to be chosen in such a way that they represent as many different aspects of zoology and as many different parts of the world as ever possible. This, however, cannot be done simply by increasing the number of Commissioners, but these are to be chosen freely among the best suited people available.

Also, I feel that every single reference to a Commissioner representing any nationality is dangerous. Then, all other nations could claim a right to be represented, and in addition to the mere increase in numbers referred to above, there will be a very real danger that the representatives would be chosen more for demonstrating a nation's proudness of existing than for the advancement of science. Also, the way has been opened for starting political implications. So, I want to propose that the number of Commissioners is again limited, say to 20.

(2) **Letter, dated 9th August, 1952, from FRANCIS HEMMING,** *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature,* **to Dr. HENNING LEMCHE** (*Copenhagen*).

Your proposal will be put down for consideration at Copenhagen in accordance with your request, along with another proposal on a different aspect of this question which I have received from a different source. Speaking personally, I disagree with your proposal, as I think you know, for it is, in my opinion, undemocratic and represents an outworn conception of the proper composition of international bodies.

(3) **Letter, dated 6th September, 1952, from Dr. HENNING LEMCHE to the Secretary to the International Commission.**

Your remark of Aug. 9th to my former letter on this question has convinced me that I am half way wrong in my view concerning the composition of the Commission. May be it will be possible to find a solution allowing us to avoid the danger which you correctly see in my former view, as well as the dangers I think we have introduced by our decisions in 1948.

DOCUMENT 66/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PRESENT REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE SIZE AND COMPOSITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

In the correspondence reproduced in Document 66/1, Dr. Henning Lemche raises the question whether the present regulations regarding the size and composition of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature are the best adapted for this purpose.

2. As explained in the paper regarding the present rules governing the size and composition of the International Commission, the election of its members and its procedure, included in the present Series as Document 64/2, it is considered that the topic raised by Dr. Lemche can best be considered in the first instance as part of the general question of the present organisation of the International Commission, other aspects of which are raised in the papers published as Documents 64/1, 67/1 and 68/1.

3. For the proper understanding of the question raised by Dr. Lemche, some knowledge is required of the historical background of the present regulations governing the size and composition of the International Commission. For this reason a brief account of this subject has been included in the general note on the organisation of the International Commission included in the present Series as Document 64/2 (see paragraphs 4—10).

CASE NO. 67

QUALIFICATIONS TO BE LOOKED FOR IN CANDIDATES FOR ELECTION AS MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION IN ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE AND METHOD TO BE ADOPTED FOR ELECTIONS TO THAT BODY

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)58)

DOCUMENT 67/1

By the **COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE CHICAGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM**

Extract from a letter dated 15th May, 1952.

The Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum proposes modifications of and additions to the Rules of Zoological Nomenclature as below stated. These proposals * are submitted to the International Commission more than one year in advance of the International Zoological Congress at Copenhagen with the request that they be put to a vote at the Section of Nomenclature of said Congress.

. . . .

Proposal 5

We propose that definite standards of eligibility be adopted for nominees to vacant positions in the Commission. It should be stated clearly that no zoologist be eligible for election regardless of his nationality or place of residence unless he be a distinguished biologist. Lists of nominees should be published by the Commission at least three months before each Congress.

---

* The other proposals here referred to which deal with different subjects have been published at the appropriate parts in the present volume.

Reasons: The election of new Commissioners has been exceedingly haphazard in the past. Some zoologists were elected to the Commission for personal or political reasons, who were far inferior in their knowledge of the science of systematics and the principles of nomenclature to other available zoologists who were not elected. The process of this self-perpetuation of the Commission should be abolished.

KARL P. SCHMIDT

DR. FRITZ HAAS

LOREN P. WOODS

ROBERT F. INGER

A. L. RAND (mostly reservations about the form of Proposal 3)

EMMET R. BLAKE

RUPERT L. WENZEL

COLIN CAMPBELL SANBORN

CLIFFORD H. POPE

D. DWIGHT DAVIS

DOCUMENT 67/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PRESENT REGULATIONS IN REGARD TO THE QUALIFICATIONS TO BE LOOKED FOR IN CANDIDATES FOR ELECTION AS MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE AND THE METHOD TO BE ADOPTED FOR ELECTIONS TO THAT BODY

In the letter reproduced as Document 67/1 the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum raises the question of the qualifications to be looked for in candidates for election as members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the method to be adopted in making elections to that body.

2. As explained in the paper regarding the present rules governing the size and composition of the International Commission, the election of its members and its procedure included in the present Series as Document 64/2, it is considered that the question here raised by the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum can best be considered in the first instance as part of the general question of the present organisation of the International Commission, other aspects of which are raised in Documents 64/1, 66/1, and 68/1.

3. For the proper understanding of the question here raised by the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum, some knowledge is required of the historical background of the present regulations relating to the qualifications of candidates for membership of the International Commission and the procedure to be followed in making elections to that body. For this reason a brief account of this subject has been included in the general note on the organisation of the International Commission included in the present Series as Document 64/2 (see paragraphs 11—16).

CASE NO. 68

PERIOD OF SERVICE OF MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)59)

DOCUMENT 68/1

By the **COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE CHICAGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM**

Extract from a letter dated 15th May, 1952.

The Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum proposes modifications of and additions to the Rules of Zoological Nomenclature as below stated. These proposals * are submitted to the International Commission more than one year in advance of the International Zoological Congress at Copenhagen with the request that they be put to a vote at the Section of Nomenclature of said Congress.

. . . .

Proposal 4

We propose that the By-Laws of the Commission provide for a more efficient rotation of Commissioners (excepting the Secretary). There should be either a definite retirement age (let us say age 70) or a provision that a Commissioner is not eligible for re-election after three successive terms of five years each.

---

* The other proposals referred to here, which deal with different subjects, have been published at the appropriate parts in the present volume.

Reasons: In past years some Commissioners have stayed in office far beyond their period of usefulness. It is important for a body like the International Commission to have new blood at regular intervals. The regulated election of new Commissioners is important to spread the changes in the Commission evenly and to ensure that at any given time only a fixed small percentage of the Commissioners is new and inexperienced.

KARL P. SCHMIDT

DR. FRITZ HAAS

LOREN P. WOODS

ROBERT F. INGER

A. L. RAND (mostly reservations about the form of Proposal 3)

EMMET R. BLAKE

RUPERT L. WENZEL

COLIN CAMPBELL SANBORN

CLIFFORD H. POPE

D. DWIGHT DAVIS

DOCUMENT 68/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE REGULATIONS AT PRESENT IN FORCE FOR SECURING THE DUE PERFORMANCE OF THEIR DUTIES BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

In the letter reproduced as Document 68/1 the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum raises the question of the measures necessary to ensure the due discharge of their duties by individual members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

2. As explained in the paper regarding the present rules governing the size and composition of the International Commission, the election of its members and its procedure included in the present Series as Document 64/2, it is considered that the question here raised by the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum can best be considered in the first instance as part of the general question of the organisation of the International Commission, other aspects of which are raised in Documents 64/1, 66/1, and 67/1.

3. For the proper understanding of the question here raised by the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum, some knowledge is required of the historical background of the present regulations for ensuring the due discharge of their duties by individual members of the International Commission. For this reason a brief account of this subject has been included in the general note on the organisation of the International Commission included in the present Series as Document 64/2 (see paragraphs 18–24).

CASE NO. 69

ON THE GIVING BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE OF ADVANCE NOTICE OF ACTION PROPOSED TO BE TAKEN IN PARTICULAR CASES

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)63)

DOCUMENT 69/1

By the NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY

Letter, dated 19th June, 1952, from Professor Charles D. Michener,
as Chairman of the above Committee, communicated by his
successor, Mr. W. I. Follett, under cover of a letter
dated 27th July, 1952

The Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology has recently made a study of a number of nomenclatorial problems. In some instances it has sent a ballot to members of the Society in order that its opinion and recommendations to you would correctly reflect the viewpoint of American taxonomists.

The material on the enclosed sheets * deals with the results of such ballots. It is transmitted to you with the request that the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be notified of the stand of the Society on the problems concerned, and that, where rules or *Opinions* are involved, this stand be considered in connection with the proposed revision of the *Règles*.

---

* The other sheets enclosed by Professor Michener are published elsewhere in the present volume.

Enclosure to Document 68/1

Advance Notice of Proposed Action by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Numerous members of the Society of Systematic Zoology believe that a major cause of the differences of opinion which have arisen among taxonomists about nomenclatorial problems since the Paris (1948) meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature stems not so much from the decisions reached at that meeting, as from failure to notify taxonomists of the proposed decisions well in advance of the meeting and to give them an opportunity to comment on the proposals. To a slight extent the need for advance notice has been satisfied by failure to print promptly the *Règles* as modified at Paris. However, to determine the views of American taxonomists on this matter, the following ballot was distributed to members of the Society of Systematic Zoology.

(1) I would prefer to require that notice of all proposed rulings of the Commission be published in appropriate journals a year in advance of final action so that those interested can express their views.

(2) I approve of allowing the Commission, without prior notice, to pass on relatively minor points (e.g., *nomina conservanda* or other matters affecting problems only in a single genus or family) at a meeting but would require that notice of all major problems or changes in rules under consideration be published in appropriate journals a year in advance of final action so that those interested can express their views.

(3) I approve the *status quo* which at least in practice permits major changes in the rules to be proposed and passed at the same meeting.

The voting was as follows :

(1) 157 (advance notice on all decisions)
(2) 158 (advance notice on major issues)
(3) 6 (advance notice not required).

In view of this vote, it is requested that binding provisions (not subject to being set aside at any single meeting or at any two meetings occurring within a single 12 months period) be adopted making it impossible for the Commission to effect any change in the *Règles* without advance notice of six months or preferably a year in the usual journals.

CHARLES D. MICHENER

Chairman, Nomenclature Committee
Society of Systematic Zoology.

DOCUMENT 69/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

PROCEDURE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE IN THE MATTER OF GIVING ADVANCE NOTICE OF ACTION PROPOSED TO BE TAKEN IN REGARD TO PARTICULAR PROBLEMS

In the enclosure to Document 69/1 particulars are given of a vote taken among the members of the Society of Systematic Zoology on the question of the giving of advance notice of matters on which action by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is contemplated.

2. It is not stated in the foregoing document when the vote there described was taken among the members of the Society. It appears, however, that the taking of this vote was prompted by the fact that decisions were taken in Paris in 1948 in regard to various matters on which advance notice had not been given in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* or otherwise.

3. In this connection it should be noted that for the last four years no decision on any individual question has been taken by the International Commission until after the application relating to the subject concerned has been published in the *Bulletin* and an interval of six months has been allowed to pass, in order to provide interested zoologists with an opportunity, should they so desire, to submit comments upon the application concerned for consideration by the members of the International Commission when they come to vote upon the proposal in question. It is not proposed to bring forward at Copenhagen for decision any applications relating to individual names, cases relating to which will continue to be dealt with by the Commission by correspondence under the normal procedure described above.

4. As regards the questions relating to the text of the *Règles* to be considered at Copenhagen this year, it will be recalled that, as regards the seven major problems which were deferred by the Paris (1948) Congress for consideration at Copenhagen in 1953, a special volume (volume 7) of the *Bulletin* was published in 1952 in which also an appeal was made to all interested specialists for advice as to the action which it was, in their view, desirable should be taken. The comments received in regard to the foregoing problems, together with the entire documentation relating to the other applications received in regard to the text of the *Règles*, have since been published in volumes 8 and 10 of the *Bulletin*.

5. In addition, in order to provide the maximum opportunity for the discussion of the foregoing matters at Copenhagen, arrangements have been made by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature (on behalf of the International Commission) for the holding in that city during the week preceding the opening of the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology of a Colloquium at which it is proposed to examine each of the problems relating to the *Règles* which will be considered when the Congress meets. Invitations to the Colloquium were issued by the International Trust to the leading Museums and other scientific institutions concerned with zoology in different parts of the world and personally also to specialists known to be interested in general problems of nomenclature.

PART 4

PROBLEMS AFFECTING THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

CASE NO. 70

COPYRIGHT OF THE PUBLICATIONS ISSUED BY THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

(Trust's reference I.T.Z.N. 34)

DOCUMENT 70/1

By the **NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY**

Letter, dated 19th June, 1952, from Professor Charles D. Michener, as Chairman of the above Committee, communicated by his successor, Mr. W. I. Follett, under cover of a letter dated 27th July, 1952.

The Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology has recently made a study of a number of nomenclatorial problems. In some instances it has sent a ballot to members of the Society in order that its opinion and recommendations to you would correctly reflect the viewpoint of American taxonomists.

The material on the enclosed sheets * deals with the results of such ballots. It is transmitted to you with the request that the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be notified of the stand of the Society on the problems concerned, and that, where rules or *Opinions* are involved, this stand be considered in connection with the proposed revision of the *Règles*.

---

* The other sheets enclosed by Professor Michener are published elsewhere in the present volume.

Enclosure to Document 70/1

COPYRIGHT OF INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE PUBLICATIONS

A survey of the attitude of American taxonomists toward the practice of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of copyrighting its publications has been completed by the Nomenclature Committee of the SSZ. The results are reported below. The survey consisted of the following statement and ballot of four choices.

" Since 1943 the publications of the ICZN (Opinions and Declarations rendered by the ICZN and the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*) have borne the statement 'All Rights Reserved '.

" The secretary of the Commission has stated that this was done to protect the financial interest of the Commission in the excess stock of these publications.

" There are some who feel that this material is of public nature and should receive the widest possible dissemination. Although the copyright is not in force in the U.S. (as of April, 1950), and perhaps these publications could not be copyrighted here because of their public nature, the result is much the same because publishing companies feel obligated to respect copyrights of other countries. Therefore, because the secretary of the Commission did not authorize quotations, at least two important works designed for the training of students in taxonomy have had to paraphrase all references to ICZN opinions published since 1943.

(1) I favour the strict application of the copyright in order to safeguard the financial interests of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature.

(2) I favour the copyright but believe that the Trust should publicly state its permission to make short quotations of portions of *Opinions*, etc., in connection with discussions of nomenclatorial matters in scientific papers.

(3) I favour the copyright to protect the Trust against unauthorized and unprofessional reprinting and believe that the Trust should publicly state that it permits quotations such as those indicated in 2 above, AND that, on application, any *bona fide* zoologist or zoological organization will be given permission to reproduce material such as rules, amendments, *Opinions*, or parts thereof in text or reference works on taxonomy, nomenclature, and related matter.

(4) I favour complete elimination of the copyright."

The voting on these choices was as follows:

(1) 1 (Strict application)

(2) 9 (Partial quotation permitted)

(3) 218 (Professional quotation permitted on application)

(4) 106 (Complete elimination of copyright).

In view of these returns, and also in view of the opinions of the individual members of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology, it is strongly urged and requested that the secretary of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature publicly state, in print, the permission of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature to make short quotations of portions of *Opinions*, etc., in connection with the discussions of nomenclatorial matters in scientific papers.

It is equally strongly urged and requested that the secretary of the ICZN publicly state, in print, that, on application, any *bona fide* zoologist or zoological organization will be given permission to reproduce material such as rules, amendments, *Opinions*, or parts thereof in text or reference works on taxonomy, nomenclature, and related matter.

CHARLES D. MICHENER

Chairman, Nomenclature Committee
Society of Systematic Zoology.

DOCUMENT 70/2

COPYRIGHT OF PUBLICATIONS ISSUED BY THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

In view of requests for guidance received as to the extent to which, and the conditions in which, documents published by it may be quoted or reproduced in other publications, the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature has issued the following announcement.

Extent to which, and conditions in which, documents published by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature may be quoted or reproduced in other publications

(1) The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature has no objection to the publication, without prior permission having been obtained, of short extracts from books, serial publications or other matter published by it, where such quotations are required for the discussion of nomenclatorial matters in scientific books or papers.

(2) The International Trust is prepared also to give sympathetic consideration to applications submitted to it to publish more extended quotations from books, serial publications and other matter published by it. In such a case the applicant should give full particulars of the extracts which it is desired to publish and the reasons why it is desired to publish those quotations and, should give an assurance that, if permission is granted, (*a*) an acknowledgment of that permission will be included in the book or paper concerned in a form to be agreed with the International Trust, (*b*) payment, by way of royalty, will be made to the International Trust of such sum as may be agreed upon between the Trust and the applicant, and (*c*), as soon as possible after the publication of a book or paper which, by permission of the Trust, contains extended quotations from books or other matter published by it, a copy of the book or paper containing these quotations will be transmitted by the applicant to the Trust at its Registered Offices.

(3) The International Trust is dependent for by far the greater part of its income upon the revenue derived from the sale of its publications. It cannot, therefore, see its way to grant permission for the publication in full by other bodies of books, articles and other matter published by it, and in the circumstances it would not expect that a request of this kind would be submitted to it.

Offices of the International Trust
for Zoological Nomenclature,
41, Queen's Gate,
London, S.W.7.
8th June, 1953.

PURCHASED
23 AUG 1955

Printed in England by Metcalfe & Cooper Limited, 10-24 Scrutton St., London E C 2

2 5 SEP 1954
PURCHASED

VOLUME 10. Double Part 16/17
Pp. 515—534, T.P.—LXIV

23rd September, 1954

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

AL HIST

LONDON:
Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International
Trust for Zoological Nomenclature at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1954

Price Two Pounds, Two Shillings

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President: Dr. Karl Jordan (*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)

President: Professor James Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Vice-President: Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*Sao Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953)

Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Professor H. Boschma (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948) (*Secretary*)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (*Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (*Université de Toulouse, France*) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (*British Museum (Natural History) London*) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*S. Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953) (*Vice-President*)
Professor J. R. Dymond (*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*) (12th August 1953)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953) (*President*)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Professor Béla Hankó (*Mezögazdasági Museum, Budapest, Hungary*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Mr. P. C. Sylvester-Bradley (*Sheffield University, Sheffield, England*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (12th August 1953)

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Double Part 16/17 (pp.515–534, T.P.–LXIV) 23rd September 1954

EDITORIAL NOTE

The present Part contains two papers relating to nomenclatorial problems dealt with earlier in the present volume which were considered by the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature, Copenhagen, 1953, but which were received too late for publication prior to the meeting of the Colloquium. These documents were submitted to the Colloquium in mimeographed form. They are now published, in order to complete the record of the documentation submitted to the Colloquium.

The first of these documents is a Report prepared by the Secretary in response to a request addressed to him by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, and is concerned with the application of a specific name, when published partly as a substitute name and partly as a name for a specified species or specimen, in cases where that species or specimen differs from that to which the rejected name is applicable. The second of these documents is a statement prepared by Professor Teiso Esaki and submitted by him on behalf of the Japanese National Committee on Zoology ; this paper is concerned with the status, under the Law of Homonymy, of names based upon the same word where that word is derived from a language employing some alphabet other than the Latin alphabet.

ADDENDUM

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO CASES
NOS. 6 AND 53
RECEIVED TOO LATE FOR PUBLICATION
PRIOR TO
THE OPENING OF
THE COLLOQUIUM ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE,
COPENHAGEN, 1953,
AND
CONSIDERED BY THAT BODY
IN MIMEOGRAPHED FORM

CASE NO. 6

The status to be accorded to a trivial name, which, when first published, was stated to be a substitute for previously published name but was in addition applied to particular species or to particular specimens in cases where the species concerned differs from that to which the earlier name is applicable

(*continued from page* 198)

DOCUMENT 6/20

REPORT BY FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Trivial Names published partly as substitute names and partly as names for specified species or specified specimens

(circulated to the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature on 15th July 1953 as Paper Z.N.(C.) 9)

Origin of investigation : The Secretary was asked to carry out this investigation by the Paris (1948) Congress[1].

2. **Preliminary Survey and Request for advice addressed to specialists :** In March 1952 (Hemming, 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7 : 119—130) the Secretary made a survey of the issues on which decisions were required and appealed to specialists to furnish advice as to the action to be taken.

3. **Comments received from specialists :** The comments received from specialists have been included in the Agenda for the Colloquium as Documents D.6/1 to 6/19. (See Part 6 (pp. 159—190) of vol. 10 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*.)

PROBLEM (1)

4. The first problem is the status to be given to a trivial name published as a substitute name for an earlier name but at the same time applied to a

---

[1] See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 499—502

particular species or to particular specimens in cases where the species concerned differs from that to which the earlier name is applicable. The comments received on this question may be summarised as follows. The numbers in brackets (parentheses) after the names of authors are the Document Numbers allotted to the papers submitted by those authors when published in the *Bulletin*. Broadly, four suggestions have been put forward :—

(a) The name should apply automatically to the species for the name of which it was published as a substitute, irrespective of any other use made of the name at the time that it was first published :

Casey (6/5) ; Bairstow (6/7) ; Sabrosky (6/12) ; American Museum of Natural History, New York (6/13) ; Hall (6/15) ; Zimmer (6/16(2)) ; Dougherty (6/19).

(b) Both the type of the species, the name of which is replaced and any other material cited by the author publishing the substitute name should be eligible for selection, under Article 31, as the lectotype of the nominal species bearing the later-published name :

Wright (6/10) ; Scientific Staff of the Berlin and Munich Museums (Hering : 6/11).

(c) The name should apply to the material described and/or figured by the author by whom it was published, that author's statement that the name was also a substitute name to be treated as a subjective misidentification by that author :

Bradley (6/17) ; also (apparently) Kruseman (6/8).

(d) The author of the new name to be treated as having (i) published a substitute name for the earlier nominal species and (ii) published a new name consisting of the same binominal combination for the species which he described and/or figured, the relative priority of these homonyms to be determined by page, line or word precedence.

Hinton (6/4).

PROBLEM (2)

5. The second problem (raised by Arkell in Document 6/3) is in relation to the selection of a lectotype for a nominal species based (i) partly upon new material and (ii) partly upon previously described or published material in cases where the author of the name for that nominal species selects as the base of that name either (1) the name of the locality (or one of the localities) from which the earlier author's material came or (2) the name of that author.

6. The general weight of opinion is clearly against the insertion of any mandatory provisions limiting the choice by an author making a lectotype selection under Article 31, though some authors either do not feel strongly on this question (*e.g.*, Casey (6/5)) or consider that, where material in the cited publications includes specimens from the locality which gives its name to the new nominal species, the choice of a lectotype should be limited to the specimens from that locality (see Bairstow (6/7) ; a similar view as regards parasitic species is expressed by Hopkins (6/6) who holds that, where the name of a new nominal species is based upon the name of one of the host species cited by the earlier author, the selection of the lectotype should be limited to those specimens of the original material which belong to species parasitic on that species. A similar situation would arise where the name selected for the later published nominal species is the name of a plant on which the species concerned is parasitic or on which it feeds (in some stage of its development).

7. Suggested adoption of a non-mandatory " Recommendation " : The idea of inserting in the *Règles* a non-mandatory " Recommendation " for the guidance of authors when selecting a lectotype in the foregoing circumstances won considerable support and raised no opposition. The general view of those support the idea of adopting such a " Recommendation " seems to be in favour of one on the following lines :—

(1) (a) Where a nominal species is established upon entirely new material or partly upon new material and partly upon previously published descriptions and/or figures and the word selected for the name of that nominal species is based either (i) upon the name of one of the localities cited or (ii) upon the name of an author referred to in connection with part of the material cited, and (b) where no holotype was designated for the nominal species in question, authors are advised, when selecting a lectotype, to select, in the former case, a specimen from the locality in question, and, in the latter case, a specimen cited by, or otherwise connected with, the earlier author, unless, in either case, there is, in the opinion of the author making the selection, strong reason against so doing.

(2) Similar advice is offered in connection with the selection of a lectotype for a parasitic species, when the name of that species is based upon the name of a host species, whether an animal or a plant.

Professor J. Chester Bradley's general proposals in regard to the procedure to be adopted when publishing substitute names

8. In his comment upon this case Bradley (Document 6/17) suggested that provision should be made under two heads (numbered by him (1) and (2)) as to the procedure to be followed by authors when publishing substitute names.

9. Further, Bradley suggests (in the same Document) the insertion in the *Règles* of a " Recommendation " giving authors advice on certain other aspects of the procedure which it is desirable should be adopted in publishing substitute names.

10. The supplementary "Recommendation" proposed by Arkell (last paragraph in Document 6/3) is concerned with one aspect of the more general question raised in the proposals by Bradley referred to in paragraph 8 above.

(signed) FRANCIS HEMMING
Secretary to the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1.
England.

15*th July* 1953.

CASE NO. 53

Articles 34 and 35 : Proposal that differences in spelling arising solely from differences in the manner in which the word forming the name has been transliterated into the Latin alphabet from some other alphabet should be ignored for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy

(*continued from page* 429)

DOCUMENT 53/3

By **REISO ESAKI** (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*)

Request for a Ruling that any two generic names or trivial names in the same genus, each based upon a word transliterated into the Latin alphabet from a language using another alphabet but differing from one another in the transliteration used, be treated as homonyms of one another

(Enclosure to a letter dated 15th June 1953)

(circulated to the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature on 27th July 1953 as Paper Z.N.(C.) 13)

In connection with the request submitted by Dr. Hachisuka (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9** : 102—103) the National Sub-Committee on Zoological Nomenclature, National Committee on Zoology, Science Council of Japan, decided to prepare the draft of a ruling to be inserted in some proper place of the *Règles* that generic or trivial names based upon the names of persons or places other than the Latin derivative or upon barbarous words, each consisting of a variant of a previously published name derived from the name of the same person or place or the same word, and are based upon a word transliterated into the Latin alphabet from a language using another alphabet, and the difference(s) so displayed is (are) due to different methods of transliteration, are to be treated as junior homonyms of the earlier names so published. This problem is especially connected with some Asiatic animals, of which the scientific names are based upon names of persons or places. The author, as the Chairman of the Sub-Committee, accordingly personally consulted and discussed the whole problem with Dr. Hachisuka and prepared the present draft, which was approved by Dr. Hachisuka and by the Sub-Committee.*

---

* Approved by Dr. Hachisuka on 8th May 1953, and by the Sub-Committee on 25th May 1953. The author regrets to record that Dr. Hachisuka died suddenly on 14th May 1953, of angina pectoris, at his residence in Atami at the age of 52.

We reached the conclusion that the ruling should cover as many cases as possible, as suggested by Mr. Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in connection with Dr. Hachisuka's application (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9** : 103). The co-ordination of various cases derived from different languages proved, however, rather difficult. The following scheme was intended to cover as many as possible of the cases involved at present.

The Sub-Committee submits to the Commission for consideration, that the recommendation to be given in connection with the Article 34 of the *Règles* and *Opinion* 147, agreed by the Commission at the 6th Meeting, Paris, July, 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 161—162) should be further expanded so as to cover as many as possible of the cases to be expected, and therefore :

It is recommended that, where it is evident that two generic names or two trivial names in the same genus (1) consist of the same Latin word or of the same Latinised word (including proper names other than modern patronymics), or (2) are based upon the same modern patronymic, or (3) are based upon the name of the same continent, country, district, town or other place or upon the name of the same geographical feature such as a mountain, island, sea, river or lake, or (4) are based upon the same barbarous word, and the said generic names or the trivial names of the same genus are distinguished from one another only by one or more of the undermentioned differences in spelling, the two names are to be treated as homonyms of one another.

(a) the use of " ae ", " oe " and " e " (*caeruleus, coeruleus, ceruleus*) ;

(b) the use of " ei ", " i " and " y " (*chiropus, cheiropus* ; *japensis, yapensis*) ;

(c) the use of " c " and " k " (*coreanus, koreanus* ; *micado, mikado*) ;

(d) the use of " v " and " w " (*okinavanus, okinawanus*) ;

(e) the use of " c " and " z " (*ceylonensis, zeylonensis*) ;

(f) the use of " s " and " z " (*lusonicus, luzonicus*) ;

(g) the aspiration or non-aspiration of a consonant (*oxyryncus, oxyrhynchus*) ;

(h) the presence or absence of a " c " before a " t " (*autumnalis, auctumnalis*) ;

(i) the use of " m " and " n " before a consonant (*septemtrionalis, septentrionalis* ; *symplecta, synplecta*) ;

(j) the use of a single or double consonant (*litoralis, littoralis*).

In the case of names derived from the names of persons or places or some other word originally written in the Cyrillic or some other alphabet, and the differences are due to the different methods (*e.g.* English, German, French or Dutch) of transliteration :

(a) the use of "u", "ou" and "oe" (*buruensis*, *bourouensis*, *boeroeensis*);

(b) the use of "kh", "ch", "gh" and "h" for Cyrillic "х" or an equivalent;

(c) the use of "ch", "tsch" and "tch" for Cyrillic "ч" or an equivalent;

(d) the use of "ts" and "z" for Cyrillic "д" or an equivalent;

(e) the use of "g" and "h" for Cyrillic "г";

(f) the use of "sh", "sch" and "ch" for Cyrillic "ш" or an equivalent;

(g) the use of "shch", "shtch", "shtsh", "schtsch" and "chtch" for Cyrillic "щ";

(h) the use of "v", "w", "f" and "ff" for Cyrillic "в" or an equivalent;

(i) the use of "zh", "dsch" and "j" for Cyrillic "ж" or an equivalent;

(j) the use of "ja" and "ya" or "ju" and "yu" for Cyrillic "я" or "ю".

In the cases of names derived from the names of persons or places of Japan or any other Japanese word, in which differences are due to the use of different systems of transliteration,* or to the use of a sharp or soft consonant, the following differences may be dealt with as shown below :

(1) Either of each of the following groups of syllables or consonants may be used to express the same sound :

> "shi" and "si"; "chi" and "ti"; "tsu" and "tu"; "fu" and "hu"; "ji", "zi" and "di"; "j" and "zy" before an "a", "o" or "u"; "sh" and "sy" before an "a", "o" or "u"; "ch" and "ty" before an "a", "o" or "u"; "m" and "n" before a labial consonant.

---

* There are several systems of transliteration used in Japan. The so-called "Hepburn's system", in which the vowels are transliterated as in German or Italian, while the consonants are latinised like in English, is the oldest in origin and is still in very wide use, while the so-called "Nippon system", based on theoretical grounds based on the construction of the Japanese language, is more strongly supported in younger academic circles than the former. The two systems differ from each other in expressing several sounds by different consonants as summarized above. A slightly modified system of the latter, the "Kunrei (or Instruction) system", was officially adopted as the standard method of transliteration by the Japanese Government in 1937, but in spite of this act, all three systems are now in use even by governmental bodies.

(2) Either consonant in each of the following groups may be used in some cases to express one and the same syllable according to the arbitrary pronunciation in preference to the other :

"k" and "g"; "s", "j" and "z"; "t" and "d"; "h" and "b"; "h" and "w"; "sh" and "j"; "ch" and "j".

The problem whether the present ruling could be further expanded as to cover cases, in which the names are derived from more or less different words of the same meaning and origin, such as *japonicus*, *japanicus* ; *nipponicus*, *niphonicus*, *nihonicus* ; *berlinensis*, *berolinensis* ; *ceylonicus*, *zeylanicus* ; or the names are derived from the same geographical term and have the ending, " -ensis ", but differ from one another in spelling, for example, such names as *borneensis*, *borneiensis*, *bornensis*, *borneoensis*, *borneonensis* ; should be submitted for further discussion. The difference in names with or without diacritical marks may also be discussed in connection with the present case, and in that event the recent article by Paclt (J. Paclt, Über die Behandlung der diakritischen Zeichen, 1952, *Senckenbergiana* **33** : 357—361) may usefully be consulted.

CORRIGENDA

page 187. Signature at bottom of page : substitute " COLBERT " for " COLLETT "

page 189. Line 7 from bottom : substitute " ZIMMER " for " SIMMER "

page 259. Heading : substitute " 24/1 " for " 25/1 "

page 273. Line 21 : substitute " 1952 " for " 1951 " substitute " 223 " for " 223—224 "

Line 30 : substitute " **6:**" for " **2:**"

page 425. Heading : substitute " 52/1 " for " 51/1 "

page 491. Lines 10, 11 and 12 : delete " (c) *Crangon* Fabricius, 1798 (an objective junior homonym of *Alpheus* Weber, 1795) : "

page 504. Heading : substitute " 69/1 " for " 68/1 "

AUTHORS' INDEX

Page

American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature ... 36—8, 152—5

American Museum of Natural History, New York ... 23, 127—8, 187, 286—7, 343, 452—3, 454

American Society of Icthyologists and Herpetologists 39—58, 215—7, 350

American Society of Parasitologists ... ... 60, 461—3

Arkell, W. J. ... 16,115, 169—71, 177—8 (ref.), 295, 310

Baily, J. L. Jr. 20, 68—70, 71—74, 125, 340

Bailey, R. M. ... 216, 228

Bairstow, L. ... 179—180, 333

Balfour-Browne, J. 335

Benson, B. 332

Blackwelder, R. E. 129—34, 380

Blake, C. H. ... ... 326—7

Bogert, C. M. 46—48, 215, 350

Bonnet, P. 65, 208, 209, 212, 231—3, 235, 237—40, 252, 434—5

Bradley, J. C. 28—35, 59, 157—61, 190—3, 247—50, 275, 277, 285—6, 345—6, 394—5, 410, 411—4, 415—6, 418—20

Page

British Museum (Natural History) London, views of workers at 331—2

Cabrera, A. 220

Caporiacco, Lodovico di, ... 66, 219—20, 234, 236, 253, 288—9, 435

Casey, R. ... ... 174—6

Chicago Natural History Museum, Committee on Nomenclature 278—9, 338, 379, 497—8, 500—1

China, W. E. 59, 162, 353

Colbert, E. H. 23, 127—8, 187, 286—7, 343

Collin, J. E. ... ... 306—8

Cox, L. R. 290—1, 361 (ref.), 363—6

Curran, C. H. 452—3, 454

Daniel, F. 12

Dougherty, E. C. 195—8, 211, 254, 255, 261—2, 354, 402—4, 404—5 (ref.)

Dymond, J. R. 16—17, 115, 339

Ellis, B. F. ... ... 328—30

Emilani, C. ... ... 76—81

Entomologische Gesellschaft, Basel 59, 156

Esaki, T. ... ... 523—526

Page

Flower, R. H. ... 313—5

Follett, W. I. 23, 33, 39, 135, 143—8, 189, 215, 348, 350, 384—6, 446—7, 455—6, 457—8, 492—3

Ford, E. B. 254

Forster, W. 19

Gertsch, W. J. ... 286—7

Gislén, T. 372

Gosline, W. A. 49, 409—10

Grensted, L. W. ... 229—30

Grobman, A. B. ... 215, 350

Haas, O. H. ... ... 164—5

Hall, E. R. 27, 135, 188, 347

Haltenorth, Th. 13—15, 111—3, 181—2, 337

Hemming, F. 39—41, 101, 102—8 (ref.), 119—24 (ref.), 136—141 (ref.), 201—3, 207, 208, 210, 213, 214, 218, 221, 222—3, 226—7, 241—3, 251, 254, 256—7, 259, 270—4, 276, 277—85, 292—4, 296, 297—8, 299—305, 355—6, 358—9, 360—3, 374—5, 376—8, 392—3, 396, 397—9, 400—1, 404—5, 406—8, 423—4, 425—6, 427—8, 430—1, 432—3, 438—42, 448—9, 464—91, 495, 496, 499, 502, 505—6, 519—522

Page

Henbest, L. G. ... 265—9

Hering, E. M. 19, 116, 185, 339

Herzog, J. S. 4

Hinton, H. E. 172—3, 177—8 (ref.)

Holthuis, L. B. 11, 102—8

Hopkins, G. H. E. 9—10, 86—8, 177—8, 206, 336, 355—6 (ref.) 421

Hubbs, C. L. ... 50, 217

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature 512—3

Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America 243

Keen, Myra A. ... 22, 342

Kerrick, G. J. 332

Kevan, D. K. McE. ... 109—10

Key, K. H. L. 59, 119—24, 194, 353, 445

Kiriakoff, S. G. ... 18, 450—1

Klauber, L. M. 387

Knight, J. B. ... 129—134

Kruseman, G. 180

Page

Lang, W. D. 83

Lemche, H. 24—7, 117—8, 166, 188, 251, 347, 384, 429, 494—5

Mayr, E. 23, 127—8, 187, 201—3 (ref.), 286—7, 288, 311 (ref.), 315—22, 326—7 (ref.), 334, 343, 452—3, 454

Meinertzhagen, R. 417

Melville, R. V. ... 290—1

Michener, C. D. 33, 36—8, 141, 388—90, 442—4, 503—4, 509—11

Miller, R. R. 51—3, 141—2, 215, 351, 387

Moore, R. C. ... 63—4, 373

Mortensen, Th. 372

Moure, Pe. J. 4

Muller, S. W. ... 22,342

Myers, G. S. ... 216,312

Nichols, J. T. 23, 127—8, 187, 217, 343

Nixon, G. E. J. 332

Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington 129—34, 380

Paclt, J. ... ... 436—7

Page

Peters, J. L. ... ... 82, 357—8, 358—9 (ref.)

Regnéll, G. ... ... 244—6

Richter, R. 90—100, 224—5, 381—3

Royal Ontario Museum of Natural History 21—2, 126, 341

Sabrosky, C. W. 32—3, 129—34, 136—41, 142, 151, 186, 387—8

Schultz, L. P. ... 5, 217

Sheljuzhko, L. 114

Smith, H. M. 53—5, 216, 351—2, 422

Smithsonian Institution Committee on Zoological Nomenclature 67

Society of Systematic Zoology 28—35, 135—51, 189, 348, 384—90, 442—4, 446—7 455—6, 457—8, 492—3, 503—4, 509—11

Stebbins, R. C. 58

Stubblefield, C. J. ... 290—1

Sylvester-Bradley, P. C. ... 309

Tate, G. H. H. 23, 127—8, 187, 286—7, 343, 452—3, 454

Page
Townes, H. 33, 142, 189, 348

Travossos, L. Filho 4

Urquhart, F. A. 21—22, 126, 341

Usinger, R. L. 28—35, 349

Vokes, H. E.... ... 323—5

Wanner, J. 361—2 (ref.), 367—71

Weller, J. M. ... 84—5, 330

Page
Wells, J. W. 34, 142, 388

Whittington, H. B. 163

Willimovsky, N. J. 56—8, 216

Wright, C. W. 89, 183—4, 344

Zimmer, J. T. 23, 34, 75, 127—8, 143, 187, 189, 286—7, 311, 343, 349, 452—3, 454

Zoologische Sammlung des Bayerisches Staates, Munchen, views of members of the Scientific Staff 340

PARTICULARS OF DATES OF PUBLICATION OF THE SEVERAL PARTS IN WHICH THE PRESENT VOLUME WAS PUBLISHED

Part No.	*Contents of Part* (*pages*)	*Date of Publication*
1/2	1—60	25th June 1953
3/5	61—166	23rd July 1953
6	167—198	1st July 1953
7	199—230	14th July 1953
8	231—262	23rd July 1953
9	263—298	23rd July 1953
10/11	299—354	23rd July 1953
12	355—390	23rd July 1953
13	391—426	24th July 1953
14	427—458	24th July 1953
15	459—514	24th July 1953
16/17	515—534	23rd September 1954
	T.P.—LXIV	23rd September 1954

INSTRUCTIONS TO BINDERS

The present volume should be bound up as follows:—T.P.—LXIV, 1—534

Note : The wrappers (covers) of the sixteen Parts in which this volume was published should be bound in at the end of the volume.

25 SEP 1954
PURCHASED

CONTENTS OF THE PRESENT PART

Page

Addendum: Documents considered by the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature, Copenhagen, 1953 which were received too late for publication prior to that meeting:

Trivial names published partly as substitute names and partly as names for specified species or specified specimens. By Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* (Document 6/20) 517

Request for a Ruling that any two generic names or trivial names in the same genus, each based upon a word transliterated into the Latin alphabet from a language using another alphabet but differing from one another in the transliteration used, be treated as homonyms of one another. By Teiso Esaki (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (Document 53/3) 523

Corrigenda 526

Authors' Index 527

Particulars of dates of publication of the several Parts in which the present volume was published 531

Instructions to binders 533

Title Page: Composition of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: Foreword by the Secretary to the Commission: Table of Contents ... ... T.P.—LXIV

Printed in England by Metcalfe & Cooper Limited, 10-24 Scrutton Street, London E C 2

1954-55
4/31
cy/-